VOLUME IV APRIL, 1909 NUMBER 3

THE AREOPAGUS OF SIDNEY AND SPENSER.

ONE of the famous literary societies of the world, according to historians of literature in recent years, was the Areopagus which came into existence in Elizabeth's reign, just when the light of Spenser's genius was beginning to show its brilliancy. We are commonly told that the society counted both him and Sidney among its members—whence its chief claim to remembrance—and also the pedantic scholar but dear friend of Spenser, Gabriel Harvey, perhaps its founder; and that it grew up in imitation of the Pléiade, the French literary society of a generation earlier. As the Pléiade sought consciously to reform and enrich the French language and to make possible a nobler French literature, so the Areopagus sought to refine and embellish the language and literature of England. How definite was the organization of either society it is difficult, perhaps now impossible, to determine. This, though, is certain of the Pléiade: Ronsard and a few other young men studied, wrote, and talked for a well-defined purpose under the direction of the eminent scholar, Jean Dorat. Their leading spirit, Ronsard, came to be recognized as their head. Whether or not they had formal meetings, they called themselves members of the Pléiade; and ever since the time of Claude Binet at least, friend, pupil, and biographer of Ronsard, their names as members of the society have been matter of record[1]. But it is a curious fact that only of late years have scholars mentioned the Areopagus as a definite literary organization and tried to fix its membership. Contemporaries, though recognizing the value of the critical work of Spenser and Sidney and their friends, are dumb regarding the Areopagus. Throughout the sixteenth century and the

[1] 'Binet's list of the poets who composed the *Pléiade*, namely, Ronsard, Dorat, Du Bellay, Baïf, Belleau, Jodelle, and Tyard, has been generally accepted as authentic,... there is no reason why Binet's list should not be accepted.' H. M. Evers, *Critical Edition of the Discours de la Vie de Pierre de Ronsard par Claude Binet*, Philadelphia, 1905, p. 135.

seventeenth, literary historians have nothing to say about it. Not until the later nineteenth century, three hundred years after its existence, do we find such historians referring to the Areopagus as an organized club. In the last thirty years, however, nearly all have agreed that some sort of a club it was, though there is difference of opinion and great vagueness regarding its organization and membership: so much so that, when we consider further the lateness of any mention of it, we have some right to question whether after all the Areopagus, as described by these recent scholars, had any reality.

If the Areopagus ever was a club, with president and secretary, or whatever in Spenser's time would have been the equivalent of these officers, we should expect to hear of it from some contemporary. We might well get word of it from Thomas Nash when, in his *Gabriel Harvey's Hunt is Up*, he insists that 'his Gabrielship' made all the capital he could out of his friendship with Spenser and Sidney[1]. Or again, we might hear of it from Ben Jonson, in whose gossipy conversations with Drummond of Hawthornden we have some of our earliest information about Spenser. Through Drummond's report of these, we hear of the death of Spenser's youngest child in the sack of Kilcolman by the Irish rebels, and that other story, probably apocryphal, of Spenser's 'dying for want of bread'; but Drummond says never a word about the Areopagus. No more does Fuller, of the generation after Jonson's, whose *History of the Worthies of England*[2] contains so many literary anecdotes. Nor is there word of it in the 1679 edition of Spenser (printed by Henry Hills for Jonathan Edwin), the introduction to which is responsible for that story of the poet's offering Sidney, on first being presented to him, the ninth canto of the first book of the *Faerie Queene*—the canto relating the visit of the Red Cross Knight to Despair. As Sidney read this, according to the tale, he bade his

[1] 'Having found...that no worke of his, absolute under hys own name, would passe, he used heretofore to drawe *Sir Philip Sydney*, *Master Spencer*, and other men of highest credit, into everie pild pamphlet he set foorth.' *The Works of Thomas Nashe*, ed. by R. B. McKerrow, London, 4 vols. 1908, III, *Have with You to Saffron Walden, or Gabriel Harvey's Hunt is up*, p. 35. Had Nash known of any formal Areopagus, he would have been likely to say here that Harvey, for his own glorification, associated himself in it with Spenser and Sidney. The only possible suggestion of a formal association between Harvey and any of the supposed members of the Areopagus is the following (*ibid.* III, 116): '*Sir Philip Sidney*...held him [Harvey] in some good regard, and so did most men; and (it may be) some kind Letters hee writ to him, to encourage and animate him in those his hopeful courses he was entered into.' This could scarcely be stretched into a hint of an Areopagus. And yet Nash must have known of it if it existed, for in his references to Harvey's nickname, 'Angel Gabriel,' and Harvey's mention of the earthquake (cf. this article, p. 294), he shows familiarity with those letters of Spenser and Harvey which are supposed to warrant the assumption that the Areopagus was a formal literary body.

[2] Fuller died in 1661. His *History of the Worthies* was published the next year.

servant give Spenser fifty pounds, which sum he speedily increased to a hundred and then to two hundred. The introduction to this 1679 edition thus shows an inclination to detail and anecdote (much to be sure erroneous), which makes it likely that were any traditions of the Areopagus then in the air, some echo of them would have reached the editor.

So it is with other editions of Spenser which I have examined for virtually the next two centuries[1], some, like that of 1679, showing a fondness for detail and anecdote in their introductory biographical notices; evidently the editors knew no rumour of an Areopagus. At the beginning of the scholarly nineteenth century, all that Ellis says which bears at all on the matter, in his *Specimens of the Early English Poets*[2], is that the dedication of the *Shepheard's Calendar* to Sidney seems to have procured Spenser an introduction to that distinguished young gentleman. In his articles on Sidney, on Sidney's devoted friend Fulke Greville, and on Sir Edward Dyer, the common friend of Spenser, Sidney, and Greville, Ellis says nothing which even hints at the Areopagus. Though H. J. Todd, who brought out an important edition of Spenser in eight vols. in 1805, quotes largely from Spenser's correspondence with Gabriel Harvey, generally supposed nowadays to have been a leading member of the society, he says nothing of the Areopagus. Similarly, literary histories through all this period fail to hint at the organization.

At last, towards the middle of the nineteenth century, suggestions of an organized Areopagus begin. The year 1839 saw on each side of the Atlantic a new edition of Spenser. The Rev. John Mitford, who wrote a biographical notice for the *Poetical Works of Edmund Spenser*, published by Pickering in London, said that the poet 'was introduced by Harvey to Sir Philip Sidney, who recommended him to his uncle, the Earl of Leicester.' He also quotes Spenser's reference to the Areopagus in his letter to Harvey, but gives no opinion regarding the society himself. About the same time Philip Masterman, in his *Essay on the Life and Writings of Edmund Spenser*, introductory to the edition published by Little and Brown, of Boston, hints at Harvey as the leader of a conscious literary movement. He adds: 'Spenser appears...to have entered into the absurd scheme, formed by Harvey and patronized by Sidney, of introducing the use of quantity into English verse.' But

[1] I have read the introductions and notes of all the editions of Spenser during this time which I have found in the Harvard Library.

[2] London, 1803, 3 volumes. See Notice of Spenser.

Masterman says no word about the Areopagus itself. Sixteen years later, however, in a new edition of Spenser by Little and Brown, we do have a hint that this was a society with some loose organization. In the biographical *Memoir* written by Professor Child, we read that the 'project for reforming English versification...seems to have originated with Harvey and to have been taken up with zeal by a coterie over which Sidney and Dyer presided.' But J. P. Collier, in his five-volume edition of 1862, makes no suggestion that this coterie was organized. Dean Church, on the other hand, in his *Spenser*, published in 1879, implies (pp. 33, 34), though he does not actually say, that the Areopagus was a formal literary body.

Since then this idea seems to have been generally accepted. True, Dr Grosart in his ten-volume *Spenser* (London, 1882–4) is non-committal as to the structure of the Areopagus, but in his *Poetical Works of Sidney*[1], he regards it as a body formally constituted. Mrs Humphrey Ward speaks of Spenser, along with Greville, Dyer, and Sidney, as 'a member of Harvey's Areopagus'[2]. Mr Symonds[3] believes in a well-organized 'academy' whose 'critical tendency was indicated by the name Areopagus, given it perhaps in fun by Spenser.' Mr Fox Bourne says[4] that the Areopagus 'was a sort of club, composed mainly of courtiers, who aspired to be also men of letters, apparently with Sidney as its president.' Spenser and other literary men belonged to it, and Harvey seems to have been 'a corresponding member and counsellor-in-chief.' Mr Bourne thinks that 'Dyer and Greville were evidently busy members.' Professor J. B. Fletcher, of Columbia University, accepts this view, for he says in an article on *The Areopagus and the Pléiade*[5]: 'What we know of the *Areopagus* is derived from references and allusions to it in the Spenser-Harvey letters of 1579–80. There we hear of Dyer and Fulke Greville as members besides Sidney and Spenser and the non-resident Harvey.' And Mr Sidney Lee[6] says that in 'the meetings of the literary club of the "Areopagus" which Leicester's friends and dependents formed at Leicester House, Spenser, Sidney, and others debated, at Harvey's instance, the application to English poetry of the classical rules of metrical quantity.' He says also in his article on Fulke Greville in the *Dictionary of National*

[1] London, 1877, I, p. lxxv.
[2] *Ward's English Poets*, I, Introduction to Poems by Fulke Greville.
[3] *Sir Philip Sidney*, London, 1886, p. 79.
[4] *Sir Philip Sidney*, New York and London, 1891, p. 200.
[5] *Journal of Germanic Philology*, II, 1899, p. 430.
[6] *Great Englishmen of the Sixteenth Century*, New York, 1904, p. 166.

Biography (1890) that Greville, Sidney, and Dyer were members of the literary society formed by Gabriel Harvey and called by him the Areopagus. And in his article on Sidney (1897), he says that they seem often to have engaged in 'formal literary debate.' Other opinions to the same effect might be quoted. These, however, are enough to show that recent scholars generally believe the Areopagus to have been a formal literary club which met at Leicester House during 1579 and 1580, years when we know that Spenser spent a great deal of his time there. Though there is doubt regarding the exact formation of the society, the consensus of opinion is that Harvey was its prime mover[1]. But living in Cambridge as he did, a Fellow of Trinity Hall, he could not have been present at many meetings of the club. He acted rather as a non-resident director[2]. His most active associates were Sidney, Dyer, Fulke Greville, and Spenser. Conjecture has included among others Spenser's friend, Edward Kirke, in all probability 'E. K.' of the *Shepheard's Calendar*; Drant, no less famous than Harvey in his efforts to apply to English verse classical rules of metre; and sometimes even Leicester himself.

Now, if literary commentators and editors of Spenser up to the middle of the nineteenth century have nothing to say of all this, whence comes the information about the Areopagus which recent scholars possess? It comes, all agree, from five letters written in 1579 and 1580, two from Spenser to Harvey and three from Harvey to Spenser. Every mention or hint of the society found in this correspondence it is worth while to consider. By so doing, we shall be able to decide for ourselves, basing our opinion on the only reliable information extant, how the Areopagus was made up.

In these letters of Spenser and Harvey the first hint of a literary club is found in Spenser's letter of October, 1579[3]. He writes:

> As for the twoo worthy Gentlemen, Master *Sidney* and Master *Dyer*, they haue me, I thanke them, in some use of familiarity: of whom, and to whome, what speache passeth for youre credite and estimation, I leaue your selfe to conceiue, hauing alwayes so well conceiued of my vnfained affection and zeale towardes you. And nowe they haue proclaimed in their *ἀρειωπάγῳ* a generall surceasing and silence of balde Rymers, and also of the verie beste to: in steade whereof, they haue, by authoritie of their whole Senate, prescribed certaine Lawes and rules of Quantities of English sillables for English Verse: hauing had thereof already great practise, and drawen mee to their faction.

[1] Mr Lee, for instance, speaks of debates 'at Harvey's instance.'

[2] Mr Bourne calls Sidney 'president' of the society, but he says that Harvey seems to have been 'counsellor-in-chief'; and Mrs Ward speaks of 'Harvey's Areopagus.'

[3] A. B. Grosart, *Works of Gabriel Harvey*, 3 volumes, London, 1884, I, p. 7.

Presently writing further of the new kind of versifying, he says, in reference to some iambics that Harvey has sent him:

> I will imparte yours to Maister *Sidney* and Maister *Dyer* at my nexte going to the Courte. I praye you, keepe mine close to yourselfe, or your verie entire friendes, Maister *Preston*, Maister *Still*, and the reste. (*Ibid.*, p. 9.)

Then, after a page or two, come some Latin hexameters in which Spenser calls Harvey his Angel Gabriel (Angelus et Gabriel), perhaps a usual affectionate nickname for him; then a polite message from Sidney; and then farewell.

Replying to this later in the month, Harvey writes, after some preliminary would-be witticisms:

> Your new-founded *ἀρειόνπαγον* I honoure more, than you will or can suppose: and make greater accompte of the two worthy Gentlemenne, than of the two hundredth *Dionisii Areopagitae*, or the verye notablest Senatours, that euer *Athens* dydde affourde of that number. (p. 20.)

In the rest of the letter he discusses principally classical versification, his favourite subject. Speaking of some experiments of Spenser in this, which Harvey finds not entirely faultless, he says that

> the Errour may rather proceede of his Master, M. Drantes Rule, than of himselfe. (p. 23.)

And a little later he says of Drant's Rules:

> My selfe neither sawe them, nor heard of them before: and therefore will neither praise them, nor dispraise them nowe: but vppon the suruiewe of them, and farther conference, (both which I desire) you shall soone heare one mans opinion too or fro. (p. 24.)

The next published letter of the two friends is one from Spenser in the following April. He mentions briefly an earthquake which had just occurred, and then goes on to discuss some English hexameters of Harvey's. Though he likes them 'so exceeding well' that he tries his pen at the same kind of verse, yet he finds 'hardnesse' in the 'accente,'

> whyche sometime gapeth, and as it were yawneth ilfauouredly, comming shorte of that it should, and sometime exceeding the measure of the Number, as in *Carpenter*, the middle sillable being used shorte in speache, when it shall be read long in Verse, seemeth like *a lame Gosling that draweth one legge after hir*: and Heauen being vsed shorte as one sillable, when it is in verse stretched out with a *Diastole*, is like *a lame Dogge that holdes vp one legge.* (p. 35.)

He wishes for perfect agreement between his friends and himself in town, and Harvey in Cambridge, regarding the rules for new schemes of versifying.

> I would hartily wish, you would either send me the Rules and Precepts of Arte, which you obserue in Quantities, or else followe mine, that *M. Philip Sidney* gaue me, being the very same which *M. Drant* deuised, but enlarged with *M. Sidneys* own

iudgement, and augmented with my Obseruations, that we might both accorde and agree in one: leaste we ouerthrowe one an other, and be ouerthrown of the rest. Truste me, you will hardly beleeue what greate good liking and estimation Maister *Dyer* had of your *Satyricall Verses*, and I, since the viewe thereof, hauing before of my selfe had speciall liking of *Englishe Versifying*, am euen nowe aboute to giue you some token, what, and howe well therein I am able to doe. (p. 36.)

Harvey's two subsequent letters, both in reply to this of Spenser's, are long and verbose. The first is chiefly concerned with the earthquake; but the second refers to that part of Spenser's letter which deals with versifying.

I cannot choose, but thanke and honour the good Aungell, whether it were Gabriell or some other that put so good a notion into the heads of those two excellent Gentlemen *M. Sidney*, and *M. Dyer*, the two very Diamondes of hir Maiesties Courte for many speciall and rare qualities: as to helpe forwarde our new famous enterprise for the Exchanging of Barbarous and Balductum Rymes with Artificial Verses: the one being in manner of pure and fine Goulde, the other but counterfet and base yl-fauoured Copper. (p. 75.)

Then soon he writes:

I would gladly be acquainted with *M. Drants* Prosodye, and I beseeche you, commende me to good *M. Sidneys* iudgement, and gentle *M. Immeritos* Obseruations. I hope your nexte Letters, which I daily expect, wil bring me in farther familiaritie & acquaintance with al three. Mine owne Rules and Precepts of Arte, I beleeue wil fal out not greatly repugnant, though peraduenture somewhat different. (p. 76.)

Still discussing verses, he speaks of some possible

delicate, and choyce elegant Poesie of good *M. Sidneys*, or *M. Dyers* (ouer very *Castor*, & *Pollux* for such and many greater matters). (p. 86.)

The rest of the letter contains mostly advice to Spenser of a personal kind, including the extraordinary wish, based on the samples of the *Faerie Queene* which Spenser had sent for Harvey's criticism, that 'God or some good Aungell' will put the younger man in a 'better mind' than to continue the poem.

Such is the correspondence of Spenser and Harvey that throws light on the Areopagus. In all this, only one reference points to Harvey as director of the society, if it ever existed—his question whether it was not the 'Aungell Gabriell,' evidently a reference to Spenser's 'Angelus et Gabriel,' that put it into the heads of Sidney and Dyer to take so much interest in reformed versifying. Here is a suggestion from Harvey himself that he was the leading spirit among the young men who dreamed of refining English poetry. But, on the other hand, when Spenser writes that he will impart Harvey's verses to Sidney and Dyer for their criticism, he implies consultation between these gentlemen and Harvey rather than direction by the latter; and

when he writes of their making a proclamation in their *ἀρειωπάγῳ*, he suggests clearly their independence of Harvey. So he does, too, in writing about Harvey's 'Rules and Precepts of Arte' and Drant's. Evidently, there were two sets of rules for applying classical metres to English verse, one by Drant and one by Harvey; and Sidney and Dyer in their experiments were as likely to use one set as the other. Moreover, Harvey himself, in writing of the 'new-founded *ἀρειόνπαγον*' and the 'choyce elegant poesie' of Sidney and Dyer, gives no hint that he is directing them. Indeed, he as much as says that he is not, when referring to their rules for versification, based on Drant's, he declares explicitly, 'myself neither saw them, nor heard of them before.' Clearly, if there was any president of the Areopagus it was not Harvey, but probably Sidney. It is even doubtful whether Harvey was one of the hypothetical members. If he was, there would seem not to have been ideal cooperation between those who made up the club in applying the rules for reformed versification. More likely, if Harvey influenced the Areopagus, he did so only as a corresponding friend of Spenser.

But what shows that the Areopagus ever had a president? In the letters of Spenser and Harvey, from which, we must remember, we get our only knowledge of the society except as recent scholars have imagined it—in these there is no hint that there were members enough to warrant any officers. Despite Mrs Ward's assertion that Fulke Greville belonged to the Areopagus; and Mr Gosse's, that 'almost the only reference to the famous Areopagus includes their names'[1] (that is, Dyer's and Greville's); and Professor Fletcher's, that 'in the Spenser-Harvey letters...we hear of Dyer and Fulke Greville as members,' there is no reference whatsoever to Greville as a member. Indeed, his name nowhere appears in the correspondence. This fact points to the conclusion that Greville had nothing to do with the Areopagus. We know that he was Sidney's closest friend, and we have verses of Sidney testifying to the literary intimacy of Greville with himself and Dyer, *Two Pastorals Made by Sir Philip Sidney*:

> Ioyne Mates in mirth with me,
> Graunt pleasure to our meeting:
> Let Pan our good God see,
> How gratefull is our greeting.
> *Ioyne hearts and hands, so let it be,*
> *Make but one Minde in Bodies three.*
>
> * * * * * *

[1] *Sir Philip Sidney*, *Contemporary Review*, L, p. 642.

My two and I be met,
A happy blessed Trinitie;
As three most ioyntly set,
In firmest band of Vnitie.
Ioyne hands, etc.

Welcome my two to me, E. D. F. G. P. S.
The number best beloved,
Within my heart you be,
In friendship unremoved.
Ioyne hands, etc.

Now had this close friend of Sidney been associated with him and Dyer in the plans for new versification of which Spenser and Harvey write so much, his name, it would seem, must have appeared in their correspondence. Since it does not, apparently Greville was not one of Sidney's and Dyer's 'whole Senate' of reformed versifiers.

What makes probability in the matter almost certainty is the further fact that Greville himself nowhere refers to the club in his *Life of Sidney*. Had he belonged to it, he could hardly have failed to mention it. From the day the two boys met at their school at Shrewsbury, Greville's devotion to Sidney was one of the governing forces of his life, and so in writing his memoirs of Sidney he had two purposes: to glorify his friend, who was also his hero, and, with pardonable pride, to dwell on the closeness of their association. Thus he not only records all the noble acts of Sidney and all the golden opinions of him expressed by great statesmen, like William of Orange, and great scholars, like Languet; he recalls also, with manifest pleasure and affection, the school days when even as a child Sidney had 'such staiedness' of mind, 'lovely and familiar gravity, as carried grace and reverence above greater years'[1]. He recalls, too, a hundred details of their subsequent adventures, whether in England or on the Continent, which testify to their mutual affection. For example, he tells circumstantially of the unsuccessful attempt of himself and Sidney, burning with the Elizabethan desire for adventure and exploration, to sail across the seas to the New World. But the Queen was often unwilling to let her favourites, in the number of whom Sidney and Greville were emphatically to be counted, stray far from her court; and so to the young men's request for permission to sail with Sir Francis Drake to the West Indies, she refused her consent. Eager for the expedition, they decided to sail, nevertheless, without the royal permission, Greville according to his own words, having 'the honor...to be' Sidney's 'loving

[1] *Life of Sidney*, Chap. I.

and beloved Achates' in the journey[1]. Their plans matured, they went to Plymouth with Drake's connivance, to embark the moment the wind should be favourable. But when they were laid in bed that night, Greville told Sidney that he feared, from the expression on Drake's face, they should not be allowed to make the voyage after all. Sure enough, royal messengers came commanding that either they be stayed or the whole fleet. By way of compensation for Sidney's disappointment, Elizabeth soon after gave him permission to serve with Leicester in the campaign in the Netherlands. Then came the fatal wound at Zutphen, and not only Greville but all England was mourning for Sidney.

This was in 1586. Greville lived on to be seventy-four years old, but he never lost his affection for his early friend. His *Life of Sidney*[2], written in his later years, was a labour of love; and when he was dead and buried his monument bore the epitaph which he himself had composed: 'Fulke Greville, Servant to Queen Elizabeth, Councillor to King James, Friend to Sir Philip Sidney.' Surely the man who, forty-two years after the death of his friend, wished this for his epitaph, would not have neglected to mention the Areopagus had he and Sidney been joint members of it. Evidently it testified neither to their intimacy, nor, in Greville's estimation, to Sidney's glory.

Now if Greville—such a dear friend of Sidney, and himself a poet—was not one of the Areopagus, its membership, we should say, must have been very limited. As a matter of fact, the correspondence of Spenser and Harvey suggests that its membership was limited to two, or at most three. The two were Sidney and Dyer, and the testimony points surely to no others. The possible third was Spenser. Harvey was clearly an outsider.

What, then, was the constitution of this Areopagus, this 'whole Senate' of two, or at most three? Pretty certainly it was not a formal body, as we may judge from Spenser's reference to it: 'Master Sidney and Master Dyer...haue proclaimed in their *ἀρειωπάγῳ* a generall surceasing and silence of balde Rymers...: in steade whereof, they haue, by authoritie of their whole Senate, prescribed certaine Lawes and rules of Quantities...for English Verse.' It looks as if Spenser, reporting the scheme of Sidney and Dyer, had applied the name of the great Athenian tribunal to them jocosely, as one to-day in raillery at the deliberation of

[1] *Life of Sidney*, Chap. VII.

[2] The title which Greville intended to give this was *A Dedication to Sir Philip Sidney*. It was to appear with the complete edition of his works. Though Greville died in 1628, the dedication was not published until 1652, when it appeared with the title which it has borne ever since, *The Life of the Renowned Sir Philip Sidney*.

two friends might speak of a decision of their Supreme Court. Now Spenser, though not conspicuously gifted with humour, as any one can tell who has read a canto of the *Faerie Queene*, was not totally without it. There are clumsy attempts at humour in these very letters to Harvey, as when Spenser, poking fun at some of Harvey's English verses in classical metre, says that they yawn and remind him of a lame gosling; and again, of a lame dog. Harvey, generally even more clumsy in his attempts at humour than Spenser, is replying in Spenser's spirit when he says:

> Your new-founded *ἀρειόνπαγον* I honoure more, than you will or can suppose: and make greater accompte of the two worthy Gentlemenne, than of the two hundredth *Dionisii Areopagitae*, or the verye notablest Senatours, that euer *Athens* dydde affourde of that number.

Apparently the high-sounding name of Areopagus was only a joke.

What strengthens the probability that the Areopagus as a literary society never existed, is the failure, already noted, of any contemporary echo of its deliberations to reach us, except the two references of Spenser and Harvey. Yet with its conjectured membership, it must, even as an informal society, have been of importance in the literary world. One would expect Sidney to make some reference to it in his *Apologie for Poetrie*, in which it is often assumed, and not improbably, that he expressed opinions which he held in common with his literary friends. Had he and they formed a club more or less known, it would have been only natural for him, in declaring his literary creed, to give it support by at least the suggestion that his fellow club-members held similar opinions. But he never does. Then again, it is singular, if the Areopagus was really a literary society modelled after the Pléiade, that it did not for convenience Anglicize its name. *Pléiade*, save for its origin, is thoroughly French; but as Spenser and Harvey write of their hypothetical society, instead of making its name English, they keep it Greek. 'In their *ἀρειωπάγῳ*,' says Spenser, using the dative case. And Harvey replying writes, 'your new-founded *ἀρειόνπαγον*,' using the accusative, which is the case called for. The Greek letters and the Greek declension point to no society that gave itself the Anglicized name Areopagus[1].

By all this I do not mean that Spenser and Sidney and the other

[1] For suggesting this significance of the Greek letters and declension, I am indebted to Mr W. E. McNeill, a graduate student at Harvard University, who, in a course on Spenser given under my direction, wrote a thesis on *The Areopagus and the Pléiade*. Mr McNeill's impression was that recent scholars have exaggerated the resemblance between the French society and the supposed English one in almost every way.

young men who might have been members of an Areopagus never came together for earnest literary discussion. During two years at least there were chances for many such meetings. It was in the summer of 1578 that Sidney with his uncle, the Earl of Leicester, in the suite of Queen Elizabeth during one of her progresses, met Gabriel Harvey at Audley End, then the greatest country-place in Essex[1]. Harvey, a native of the neighbouring town of Saffron Walden, had come as one of the literary lights of Cambridge, some fifteen miles away, to make an address to the Queen. In Latin verses which he wrote for the occasion, entitled *Gratulationes Waldenses* and filled with laudation of the sovereign, he spoke of Sidney also in terms of highest praise. Perhaps he had met Sidney before, for Harvey seems to have been already known to Leicester[2]. If so, after the meeting at Audley End and the complimentary Latin verses, Harvey was probably in greater favour with both Leicester and his nephew. Perhaps that is why Harvey seems soon afterwards to have been able to procure a place for his friend, Spenser, who had been living in the north of England, in the household of Elizabeth's favourite. Thus the opportunity was given at Leicester House for a friendship between Spenser, then about twenty-six, and Sidney, who was twenty-four.

The two young men, with the many literary tastes which they had in common, did not fail to improve their opportunity. We have seen in Spenser's letters to Harvey that he made use of the opportunity likewise to know Dyer, who was a few years older than Sidney. All three seem to have esteemed Harvey and to have valued his opinions on the classics, because of his well-known scholarship and his six or seven years seniority of Spenser. We have seen, also, in the letters of Spenser and Harvey, that the latter was in frequent consultation with his three friends in London about classical metres. No doubt when he came to town, he talked with them at length on the subject.

It would be odd if sometimes other friends of the three young men were not present when they discussed literary matters. At such times we might imagine more interesting conversations than those in Harvey's company, for his letters suggest that there would have been difficulty in getting him off his favourite metrical subject. Possibly Spenser introduced his friend Kirke to Sidney and Dyer. Possibly Greville talked with them occasionally; but, as we have seen, not often; other-

[1] Cf. Fuller's *Worthies*.

[2] When Harvey was presented to the Queen she spoke of him as one of whom she had previously heard from Leicester.

wise there would have been mention of the fact in his *Life of Sidney*. Indeed, for the time being, if we may judge from the letters of Spenser and Harvey, Dyer was Sidney's closest literary friend, perhaps because he reflected Sidney's opinions better than Spenser and Greville, who were more independent. Despite Sidney's verses, too, about the 'happy blessed Trinitie' which he and Dyer and Greville made up, we may, considering the weakness of human nature, wonder if Greville was not somewhat jealous of Dyer. Three-cornered friendships are seldom entirely agreeable. It may be significant that in his *Life of Sidney*, Greville mentions Dyer but once, and then only as the messenger who 'stayed him by a princely mandate' on one of the several occasions when his youthful desire for travel and adventure was balked by Queen Elizabeth's fondness.

The serious and enthusiastic literary talks of Spenser, Sidney, and Dyer had notable results. More or less they served the purpose, indeed, which the Areopagus would have served had it existed. To them, probably, the critical opinions expressed in the introduction and notes of the *Shepheard's Calendar* owed something, as did also the *Apologie for Poetrie*. The same talks probably quickened and helped to define the poetical feelings which found expression in the *Arcadia* and in the various poems of Sidney and Spenser. *The Faerie Queene*, when still only tentative fragments were written, won so much praise from Sidney that Spenser had little hesitation about going on with it[1]. No doubt, too, knowing French literature and Italian, the young men discussed the critical opinions not only of classical authors but also of recent continental writers. But there is nothing to show that these meetings were not purely casual. If there was any pre-arrangement, it was in all probability nothing more than a tacit agreement of Sidney and Dyer to meet from time to time for reading and discussion. The existence of a literary club with definite membership, known as the Areopagus, is doubtful. Except the statements of scholars in the last fifty years, there seems to be no evidence that Spenser and Sidney and their friends ever organized such a society.

HOWARD MAYNADIER.

CAMBRIDGE, MASS., U.S.A.

[1] See the poem of 'W. L.' in the *Verses to the Author*, prefatory to the *Faerie Queene*.

THE SOURCES OF HEBBEL'S 'AGNES BERNAUER.

I.

The Ideas underlying the Drama.

We have Hebbel's own authority for commencing an inquiry into the sources of *Agnes Bernauer* with a consideration of the ideas underlying the play, for he himself has drawn attention to the fact that in all his earlier dramas, the ideas, which he saw embedded in the material, formed the starting-point for his inspiration. *Gyges und sein Ring*, he tells us[1], was the first drama in which he started from the story not from the idea. And *Agnes Bernauer*, Hebbel's only drama on national history, is no exception to the rule. The historical drama, according to Hebbel, was to have a definite 'meaning' ('Bedeutung'), that is, give expression to some idea, which would give unity to the work, emphasize the general in the particular and so be symbolical for all times: 'dass Herodes das Christenthum als erhabenstes Cultur-Instrument feiert, dass Michel Angelo die tiefste Demuth predigt, dass Agnes Bernauer den Staat als die Grund-Bedingung alles menschlichen Gedeihens hinstellt, der jedes Opfer fordern darf, und dass Gyges an die ewigen Rechte der Sitte und des Herkommens mahnt[2]': was of primary importance in the eyes of the poet, and only after full justice had been done to the idea, did Hebbel allow patriotic motives to come to the front[3]. As may be seen from numerous entries in his diaries, Hebbel frequently invented plots to illustrate favourite ideas; many of these dramatic plans were never utilized, but when Hebbel found

[1] Letter of December 14, 1854 (Hebbel's *Sämmtliche Werke*, herausgegeben von R. M. Werner, Berlin, 1901 ff. *Briefwechsel*, v, 204). For convenience, this edition of Hebbel's correspondence will be referred to in the following pages as *Bw.*, the *Tagebücher* and *Werke* in the same edition as *Tb.* and *S. W.* respectively.

[2] Letter of Nov. 11, 1857 (*Bw.*, vi, 74). The extreme importance which Hebbel placed on the 'fundamental motive' of a drama is seen in the fact that he attributed the failure of the contemporary Hohenstauffen tragedies to the circumstance that they merely depicted history (cp. *Tb.*, ii, 338).

[3] Letter of Jan. 27, 1863 (*Bw.*, vii, 291).

a theme in history or saga suited to voice his views, poetic inspiration often set in and the drama was written in a comparatively short space of time. This was the case with *Agnes Bernauer*: the ideas which underlie it were conceived long previously and are intimately connected with Hebbel's earlier works and his whole line of thought, but the actual work on the drama occupied only three months[1]. In the early autumn of 1851 Hebbel returned from a lengthy visit to Berlin, and, as we see from his correspondence, he found plenty of work awaiting him[2]. But, as often before, the autumn roused his creative faculties and by Oct. 6 he had already half finished 'ein kleines Lustspiel' and was busily engaged on 'a great German tragedy[3].' This was *Agnes Bernauer*. On Oct. 14, he completed the second act, on Oct. 26, the third; the fourth act, commenced on Nov. 1, was finished on Nov. 25, and on Dec. 7 he writes that there were only a few scenes wanting in the tragedy[4]. These were written by Dec. 17, and by Christmas Eve 'die letzten Ratten- und Mäuselöcher' were filled up[5]. Thus the whole drama was written within the space of three months; the poet experienced even more than usual happiness in his work, and, as is to be seen from his letters and diaries, was more than usually confident of its success and value[6].

We do not know how Hebbel first became acquainted with the story of Agnes Bernauer, which was so well adapted to embody his various plans and ideas. Perhaps, as he himself says[7], Törring's drama was one of the chief reasons which induced him to write on the same subject, but it is just possible that he first heard of Agnes Bernauer on the occasion of his visit to Munich in 1838, the scene of part of the drama and the town where so many of his later plays were conceived[8]. It was there that he heard Görres' lectures on the Middle Ages, which inspired him with the wish: 'Wär' man doch damals geboren[9]!' At Munich also he formed the plan of a great mediaeval tragedy dealing with the Maid of Orleans[10]. Whether Hebbel had considered the problem of *Agnes Bernauer* before he read Törring's drama or not, the fact remains that there is no mention of the subject in his diaries and correspondence until he commenced work on the tragedy.

[1] Cf. R. M. Werner's Introduction to *Agnes Bernauer* (*S. W.*, III).
[2] See letter of Sep. 17, 1851 (*Bw.*, IV, 320).
[3] *Bw.*, IV, 326—7.
[4] *Bw.*, IV, 333, and diary.
[5] *Tb.*, III, 413.
[6] See especially letter of Jan. 23, 1852 (*Bw.*, IV, 345).
[7] Letter of Aug. 20, 1853 (*Bw.*, V, 123).
[8] Cf. *Einen Geburtstag auf der Reise* (*S. W.*, VI, 247).
[9] Letter of Jan. 30, 1837 (*Bw.*, I, 162).
[10] Cf. E. Kuh, *Biographie F. Hebbels*, Vienna, 1877, I, 384—5.

The earliest entry in his diary concerning the play clearly points to the idea which first of all attracted him to the story of Agnes Bernauer: 'Längst hatte ich die Idee, auch die Schönheit einmal von der tragischen, den Untergang durch sich selbst bedingenden Seite darzustellen und die Agnes Bernauerin ist dazu, wie gefunden[1].' The tragic fate of perfection, whether moral or physical, had long been one of Hebbel's favourite thoughts; it had already found poetic expression in *Genoveva* and seems to have been particularly brought home to him during his stay in Rome in the spring of 1845. The beauty of nature which surrounded him there, inspired him with the poem *Das Opfer des Frühlings*[2], in which Spring at the height of his glory feels a sudden sadness, when gazing at the reflection of his beauty in the stream:

> Denn ihm sagt ein inn'res Stocken,
> Dass die Götter neidisch sind.

The beauty of the Roman women also made a great impression on the mind of the poet, the exceptional loveliness of Signorina Gagiati, especially, dwelt long in his memory[3]. It is not surprising then that Hebbel, who was always so prone to look at the dark side of things, should, when surrounded by so much beauty, have often recurred to the idea that great physical perfection may be not a blessing but a curse to its possessor. Thus we find that in January 1845 Hebbel conceived the idea of two tragedies both dealing with this negative aspect of beauty. The first was to show the ill effects which beauty produces on the character of a young girl; she grows ambitious, is not content with her station in life, arouses the envy and ill-will of her neighbours and finally commits suicide[4]. The second tragedy, in which we distinctly see the germ of *Agnes Bernauer*, deals with the harm which the great beauty of an innocent girl may cause in the world through no fault of her own[5]. Certain points in this plan show an unmistakable likeness to the first act of *Agnes Bernauer*. Agnes also (Act I, sc. 5) through no fault of her own has, when the play opens, disturbed the peace of the inhabitants of Augsburg: the men admire her and grow indifferent to the women they had formerly loved; these hate Agnes, and she finds herself forsaken by her former friends. Already afraid of the effects of her own beauty, she does not wish to attend the tournament, and might perhaps, if Albrecht had not crossed her path, have followed the advice of her jealous friend Barbara and entered a convent.

[1] *Tb.*, III, 406 (Sept. 30, 1851).
[2] *S. W.*, VI, 217.
[3] Letter of Jan. 30, 1845 (*Bw.*, III, 195).
[4] *Tb.*, III, 4—5 (Jan. 8, 1845).
[5] *Tb.*, III, 2—3 (Jan. 1845).

As the drama advanced, other ideas came more into the foreground; especially the political element gained in importance—'das Werk belehrte den Meister[1]'—and so the relation of the individual to the state and the duty of a king to his subjects became gradually clearer to the poet. Curiously enough, it was again at Rome that Hebbel seemed to have first considered the rights and duties of the head of the state. An entry of Feb. 21, 1845, bears directly on the fundamental problem of *Agnes Bernauer*: 'Ein König hat weniger Recht, ein Individuum zu seyn, als jeder Andere[2].' For Albrecht insists on exercising his rights as individual, without considering that, as the heir apparent, he has less right to exercise them than anybody else.

At this time also Hebbel sketched out other dramas, which were to deal with the tragic aspect of kingship. One only bears slightly on *Agnes Bernauer*—a king resigns because he sees that his supreme power would have enabled him to commit a terrible crime, and wishes to escape temptation for the future[3]. Ernst also resigns because his position has obliged him to bring about the death of Agnes, and he wishes his son to acknowledge the justice of his action. A similar idea occurred to Hebbel, when witnessing a performance of *Emilia Galotti*; he would have concluded Lessing's play in the manner of *Agnes Bernauer*: 'der Prinz, erschüttert durch Emilias Tod, giebt seinem Lande eine Verfassung[4].'

The political events of 1848 influenced Hebbel profoundly and again brought home to him the responsibilities and duties of the kingly office; they also enabled him to perceive the bearing of the social problems of *Agnes Bernauer* on his own day; 'der tiefe Schmerz um Deutschland hat mir dies Drama abgepresst[5].' These events also caused Hebbel to lay special stress on the subordination of the individual to the state: he himself draws attention to the fact that this doctrine is preached in all his works[6], and he realizes that it will not meet with the approval of the 'hollow democracy' of his time.

The murder of Agnes is the logical outcome of Hebbel's view of the absolute necessity for the complete subordination of the individual to

[1] *Tb.*, III, 413 (Dec. 24, 1851). [2] *Tb.*, III, 40.
[3] *Tb.*, III, 64 (Sept. 29, 1845).
[4] *Tb.*, III, 68 (Dec. 15, 1845). It might also be noticed that a few years before the conception of *Agnes Bernauer* Hebbel had turned his attention to the story of Struensee (1849) and had come to the conclusion that a like lesson could be drawn from it: 'Am Schlusse der Tragödie wird...jeder Kronenträger demuthsvoll ausrufen: ich will kein Gott mehr sein' (*S. W.*, XI, 291).
[5] Letter of Jan. 23, 1852 (*Bw.*, IV, 344).
[6] Letter of Feb. 16, 1852 (*Bw.*, IV, 359).

the welfare of society. She is sacrificed like so many of Hebbel's heroine's; while Judith and Clara voluntarily give their lives, the one to rescue her fellow-townsmen, the other to save her father, while Marianne dies rather than sacrifice her individuality, Agnes, who in her passivity may be compared with Genoveva, is sacrificed for the good of Bavaria. But Agnes is not the only 'martyr' in the drama; Hebbel lays almost as much stress on the sacrifice which Ernst has to make. He has, in his devotion to duty, to commit a deed which his soul abhors, and also to imperil the life of his son, for he is not for one moment in doubt as to the possible effect of Agnes's murder on Albrecht. This idea can also be traced far back in Hebbel's life. As early as March, 1841, the poet notes Abraham's sacrifice of his son as a suitable subject for a tragedy: 'die Idee des Opferns müsste aus ihm selbst kommen und je schwerer ihm die Ausführung fiele, um so mehr müsste er an dem furchtbaren Pflichtgedanken fest halten. Dann die Stimme des Herrn[1].' The likeness to Herzog Ernst is unmistakable, he tries every other means before sacrificing his son; then, when he thinks he sees the divine hand in the death of the little Prince Adolf, he puts all his trust in God and knowingly sacrifices his son to save his country (Act IV, sc. 5).

This brings us to another of Hebbel's theories, namely the intervention of the Deity in human affairs[2]. In his history of the Maid of Orleans written as far back as 1840, Hebbel expressed the opinion: 'in solchen schicksalschwangeren Augenblicken,...wo Niemand Recht und Unrecht zu sondern...wagt, hat der schwindelnde Mensch ein Gefühl, als müsste die Gottheit selbst aus ihren Finsternissen hervortreten und mit flammendem Schwert auf den Weg deuten, der gewandelt werden soll[3],' and this idea has found expression in several of his dramas. Thus Judith acts by divine inspiration, and at the close of the play her fate is left dependent on the divine will; Golo directly challenges divine intervention, when he ventures on the perilous ascent: 'Brech' ich nicht Hals und Bein zu dieser Stund', So leg' ich's aus: ich soll ein Schurke sein' (*Genoveva*, Act I, sc. 3).

In no play of Hebbel is such prominence given to this idea as in *Agnes Bernauer*, for Ernst is firmly convinced that God himself desires

[1] *Tb.*, II, 105. Cf. also the sacrifice of Judas in the *Christus* fragment, Hebbel's *Sämmtliche Werke*, herausgegeben von E. Kuh, Hamburg, 1866 (VI, xxxi).

[2] Cf. Bulthaupt, H., *Dramaturgie des Schauspiels*, Oldenburg, 1894, III, 135—140. Also *Tb.*, II, 73 (Oct. 26, 1840).

[3] *S.W.*, IX, 238. A. v. Weilen, *Hebbels historische Schriften* (*Forschungen zur neueren Literaturgeschichte*, *Festgabe für R. Heinzel*, 1898), p. 442.

the death of Agnes—'Gott will es so und nicht anders' (Act IV, sc. 4)—and has placed the decision in divine hands by proclaiming Adolf his successor and not signing Agnes Bernauer's death-sentence as long as there was an heir, 'und Gott selbst hat den harten Spruch bestätigt, da er den jungen Prinzen zu sich rief, der die Vollziehung allein aufhielt' (Act V, sc. 2). It is rather difficult to account for this divine intervention even from Hebbel's point of view; we can quite understand that in *Judith* God protected His chosen people, and Hebbel has told us that the Maid of Orleans was inspired to save that nation because from France 'die Revolution ausgehen sollte[1]'; but there seems to be no adequate reason why Bavaria should be selected.

There remains one more of Hebbel's dramas, the 'Grundidee' of which is closely connected with that of *Agnes Bernauer*; when in the latter drama Kanzler Preising tries to convince Agnes of the necessity of the death-sentence in the following words: 'Und wenn's einen Edelstein gäbe, kostbarer, wie alle zusammen,...und ringsum die wildesten Leidenschaften entzündend,...dürfte der Einzige, der noch ungeblendet blieb, ihn nicht...ergreifen, und in's Meer hinunter schleudern' (Act V, sc. 2), we are at once reminded of the 'Märchendrama' *Der Rubin*, in which the jewel brings happiness to its owner as soon as he casts it from him, in accordance with one of Hebbel's favourite maxims, 'Wirf weg, damit du nicht verlierst.' Similarly Albrecht has to renounce Agnes in order to regain his true self.

Thus the fundamental problems of *Agnes Bernauer* are intimately connected with Hebbel's previous work, and many plans conceived at various periods of his life were woven into it. The following entry in his diary, made during his work on *Julia*, applies even more to the writing of *Agnes Bernauer*: 'das Stück breitet sich weiter aus, als ich gedacht hatte, und nimmt sehr viel in sich auf, was in mir fertig war[2].'

II.

Hebbel's Historical Sources.

Before proceeding to investigate the histories and chronicles actually consulted by Hebbel, it may be well to consider briefly Hebbel's conception of the attitude of the dramatist towards an historical subject in general[3]. To a poet, who laid so much emphasis on the distinction

[1] *Tb.*, II, 55 (July 27, 1840). [2] *Tb.*, III, 128 (Nov. 29, 1846).

[3] Cf. H. Koch, *Über das Verhältnis von Drama und Geschichte bei F. Hebbel* (Munich Dissertation). Leipzig, 1904.

between Art and Life[1] and consequently between history and an historical drama, the thought was intolerable that the duty of a dramatist should be identical with that of the historian and should be comprised in the endeavour to bring the past vividly before us by closely following its records. If the historian and the poet have the same function, Hebbel did not see the *raison d'être* of the poet[2]. 'Der Dichter ist nicht der Auferstehungsengel der Geschichte'; he has higher aims and so need not keep close to history, for 'für wen das von der Geschichte abweichende historische Drama eine Sünde an der Geschichte ist, für den muss auch der Tisch eine Sünde am Baum seyn[3].'

On what then is the poet to rely, if he is not, like the historian, to acquire a knowledge of life in the past by a laborious study of records? Hebbel has but one answer: 'inspiration'; at a flash the past in all its bearings must rise vividly before his eyes, as, for example, the drama of *Judith* took shape in Hebbel's mind before Giulio Romano's picture in the Munich gallery[4]. In his correspondence Hebbel has given an account of this inspiration: 'ich bereite mich so wenig auf [ein Drama] vor, wie auf einen Traum, und begreife nicht einmal, wie man das kann. Ich sehe Gestalten, mehr oder weniger hell beleuchtet, sey es nun im Dämmerlicht meiner Phantasie oder der Geschichte, und es reizt mich sie fest zu halten, wie der Maler; Kopf nach Kopf tritt hervor und alles Übrige findet sich hinzu, wenn ich's brauche[5].' Events thus intuitively seen, have the same effect on the poet as those he has actually experienced—'so erlebt der Dichter die Geschichte[6]'—and have a far higher value than the results of historical research[7]. The chief duty of the poet towards history consists, according to Hebbel, in bringing into prominence the idea which underlies the historical data and which in real life is often hidden. This idea was in all Hebbel's earlier dramas the starting-point for his inspiration; thus we have seen how in *Agnes Bernauer* the conception of the harmful effects of beauty first attracted him to the subject and how the relation of the individual to the state interested him as the drama proceeded.

According to these views we should expect that Hebbel would only study historical sources superficially before setting to work on a drama,

[1] *Tb.*, IV, 161 (March 7, 1860).
[2] Cf. *S. W.*, XI, 59.
[3] *Tb.*, III, 217 (March 10, 1847).
[4] *S. W.*, I, 410.
[5] Letter of Dec. 2, 1858 (*Bw.*, VI, 216).
[6] Hebbel's *Briefwechsel*, herausgegeben von F. Bamberg, Berlin, 1890–2, II, 475.
[7] Cf. his criticism of Massinger's *Ludovico*. Hebbel exclaims, 'das kann nicht wahr sein...hier ist Josephus schlecht unterrichtet' (*S. W.*, XI, 250).

but we find that exactly the opposite is the case. Instead of merely concerning himself with the outlines and the main ideas underlying the subject, we find that he made most thorough and painstaking investigations of all the historical sources at his command. He attached great importance to the delineation of the *milieu*. Every character in the drama 'must be rooted in his times' and must reflect his surroundings in every utterance. Thus the characters of *Agnes Bernauer* should speak as Germans of the fifteenth century, each again differently according to his station, and the whole play must be pervaded by the 'Zeitgeist' of Germany at the close of the Middle Ages[1].

Turning now to Hebbel's historical studies in connection with *Agnes Bernauer*, we find that on the whole he kept pretty closely to his sources as the facts were peculiarly well adapted to give expression to several of his favourite theories; only a few alterations were necessary to give special prominence to these ideas. 'Ich habe eine einfach rührende, menschlich schöne Handlung, treu und schlicht, wie der Chronist sie überliefert, in die Mitte gestellt und das Reich mit allen seinen Elementen steht dahinter[2].' We see from Hebbel's contemptuous reference to Melchior Meyr's work that he did not consider the study of recent historians sufficient: 'er [Meyr] hat höchstens im Falkenstain, vielleicht nur im Mannert geblättert, gewiss aber nicht die Quellen gelesen[3],' and from his conversation with the king of Bavaria that he consulted 'Chroniken,' but not 'Reichsarchive[4].'

Professor R. M. Werner mentions[5] that the Goethe and Schiller Archive has in its possession a piece of bluish paper with notes in Hebbel's handwriting from which some of his sources can be inferred. Besides the books mentioned in the letter to Dingelstedt, namely J. H. von Falckenstein's *Vollständige Geschichten...des grossen Herzogthums...Bayern*, III. Theil, München, Ingolstadt und Augspurg, 1763, and K. Mannert's *Die Geschichte Bayerns aus den Quellen*, Leipzig, 1826, Prof. Werner notes P. von Stetten's *Geschichte der...Stadt Augspurg*, Frankfurt und Leipzig, 1743, and *Marx Welsers des Jüngern Chronica der Stadt Augspurg*...Translated by Engelbert Werlich, Frankfurt am Main, 1595. In addition to these, the following investigation will show that Hebbel in all probability also used F. J. Lipowsky's *Agnes*

[1] Cf. Hebbel's opinion of *Genoveva*, 'ich glaube, was in diesem Stück wirkt, ist die concentrirte Darstellung des Mittelalters' (*Bw.*, IV, 315).
[2] Letter of Dec. 12, 1851 (*Bw.*, IV, 337).
[3] Letter of Jan. 26, 1852 (*Bw.*, IV, 348).
[4] Letter of March 3, 1852 (*Bw.*, IV, 382).
[5] *S. W.*, III, 442—3.

Bernauerinn, Munich, 1800, and an anonymous translation of Veit Arnpeck's *Chronicon Boioariae* printed by M. von Freyberg (*Sammlung historischer Schriften*, I, 1827). These are most likely all the historical works consulted by the poet, as almost all deviations from them can be explained as concessions to the ideas which Hebbel desired to embody in the drama. The chief chronicles, besides those already cited, which mention Agnes Bernauer, such as Oeffele's and Adlzreiter's, are in Latin, and as we have it on Hebbel's own authority (for example, *Tb.*, Oct. 16, 1839; Jan. 19, 1842) that he was never able to read that language, it is extremely unlikely that he consulted them.

A. Hebbel's Indebtedness to Lipowsky's 'Agnes Bernauerin.'

There is no mention of Lipowsky's book in Hebbel's diaries and correspondence, but the fact that he does not mention it is not conclusive evidence that he did not know it, for he also makes no reference to Braunfels' translation of the *Nibelungenlied*, and yet Professor Werner has a copy of that work in his possession with notes in the poet's handwriting, and in many instances direct borrowing of phraseology from this translation is traceable[1].

Lipowsky's little book on Agnes Bernauer tells her story in a sentimental and rather didactic manner; at the end of the book there are numerous notes in which the author endeavours to justify his statements by quotations from chronicles (Latin and German), and in an appendix we find original documents of the period, such as Ernst's instructions to his chancellor and the 'Stiftungsurkunden,' in which Albrecht decreed that a perpetual mass should be held in memory of Agnes Bernauer. These documents must have been invaluable to Hebbel, who, as we have seen, wished to get as near the original sources as possible. The 'Personennamen' point to Lipowsky: the following names seem to have been taken from him: Degenberg (*Agnes Bernauer*, Act v, sc. 8, Lipowsky, p. 103); Nothhaft, or, as Hebbel writes, Nothhafft von Wernberg (Lipowsky, p. 106; but this name also occurs in other sources)[2]; Caspar Bernauer, again, is named only by Lipowsky (p. 15), and it is interesting to note that Otto Ludwig, who in his later versions of *Agnes Bernauer* followed Lipowsky[3], also calls Agnes's father Caspar;

[1] See Annina Periam, *Hebbel's Nibelungen*, New York, 1906, 25; also Werner's note, *S. W.*, IV, 346.

[2] The name Pienzenau (Lipowsky, p. 173) also occurs in Törring's *Agnes Bernauerin*.

[3] O. Ludwig's *Nachlass* (I, 149) herausgegeben von M. Heydrich, Leipzig, 1874.

finally Emeran Nusperger zu Kalmperg, who plays such a mysterious part in the drama, is expressly mentioned by Lipowsky (p. 36) as deputed to carry out the death-sentence.

Appended is a brief review of the chief similarities to Lipowsky in the order in which they occur in Hebbel's drama. Only those cases have been noted where Lipowsky deviates from the other sources expressly mentioned by Hebbel.

Act I, sc. 14: Lipowsky states that Albrecht, whilst attending the tournament at Augsburg, first heard of Elizabeth's flight and shortly afterwards saw Agnes Bernauer for the first time. This is also the sequence of events in Hebbel's drama. Moreover, both Lipowsky (p. 7) and Hebbel mention that the town of Göppingen was given as a pledge by the Duke of Würtemberg. I can find no reference to this town in any other history or chronicle, nor does it occur in Törring's drama. It should however also be noticed that Hebbel quotes a different sum for the 'Strafgeld.'

Act I, sc. 18: Caspar's reference to the 'Unehrlichkeit' of the 'Bader.' Werlich (p. 115) merely notes that the 'Bader' formed a special 'Zunft,' but Lipowsky (pp. 24, 89) specially mentions that 'Bader' were considered 'unehrlich' until the fifteenth century.

Act III, sc. 5: Lipowsky mentions that in 1468 a 'Stiftskirche' was built over the grave of Ernst's wife. In the play Ernst himself is represented as having the chapel built.

In the development of the plot in this act, there are several striking coincidences with Lipowsky: (1) Albrecht's marriage is kept secret for some time (p. 19). (2) Ernst regards the affair with Agnes as mere gallantry and thinks that his son will soon tire of her. (3) Ernst determines to marry Albrecht to Anna von Braunschweig in order to separate him from Agnes. (4) Albrecht refuses to marry Anna. (Falckenstein, p. 463, merely mentions that Albrecht was married to Anna after the death of Agnes Bernauer 'um seinen Schmerz zu lindern und vertreiben'; in Törring's drama—Act II, sc. 3—a marriage with Anna is proposed after the tournament in order to conciliate Albrecht and 'um ihn nicht ganz von der Liebe zu entwöhnen!')

Act III, sc. 13: As will be shown later, Hebbel borrowed a few minor details from Törring in this scene, but in the main action he has closely followed Lipowsky. This whole tournament scene is, strictly speaking, unhistorical; Oefelle[1] relates that Albrecht was insulted and struck ('impugnatus et percussus') at a tournament held at Regensburg

[1] Quoted by Lipowsky, p. 94.

in 1434, because he would not contract a legitimate marriage. The other chroniclers who mention the tournament, Andreas von Regensburg and Hochwart[1], for example, say pretty much the same, but not one of them mentions the presence of Herzog Ernst. From this statement Törring would appear to have built up his 'Turnierscene' in which he has been followed by every other dramatist of *Agnes Bernauer*, and curiously enough also by the historian Lipowsky, who describes what occurred at Regensburg in these words[2]: 'Schon wollte er den Kampfplaz in voller Rüstung betretten, als man ihm eröfnete: er dürfe nicht turnieren, für ihn wären die Schranken geschlossen, weil er ein Mädchen unehrlich hielt....Dieser ihm öffentlich...erwiesene Schimpf machte den Herzog Albrecht rasend. Wütend drang er auf jene ein, die ihm die Turnier-Schranken nicht öfnen wollten; ich gebe mich nicht mit einer Buhldirne ab,...rief er mit hallender Stimme, Agnes ist meine Gattin, meine Gattin durch das Band der Ehe, geschlossen im Angesicht der heiligen Kirche; und so kam es dann hier selbst zu Thätigkeiten, wobei Herzog Albrecht sogar geschlagen wurde.' It will be noted that Lipowsky has followed Törring in two respects: Albrecht is not allowed to enter the lists, and delivers a passionate speech; but Albrecht's declaration that Agnes Bernauer is his lawfully wedded wife appears to be Lipowsky's own invention. The only authorities that he can bring forward on this point are Adlzreiter's statement that Albrecht openly boasted of his ignoble marriage (p. 92), and Falckenstein, III, 460: 'Albrecht liess sich öffentlich verlauten, er würde sich wider Willen seines Vaters dieselbe als eine rechtsmässige Gemahlin antrauen lassen' (p. 93).

Returning to Hebbel's play, we notice a most important resemblance to Lipowsky, and that in a point which has just been shown to be the historian's invention, namely Albrecht's declaration of his marriage at the tournament, and if further evidence were needed that Hebbel was immediately influenced by Lipowsky, it is to be found in the fact that the latter (p. 92) quotes as 'Artikel 10' of the 'Heidelberger und Heilbrunner Turnier-Ordnungen' the phrase 'welcher vom Adel geboren und herkommen ist,...und Frauen und Jungfrauen schwächte...,' and that Ernst in Hebbel's drama also orders the 'Marschall' to read this article and the official thereupon uses the identical words quoted by Lipowsky.

[1] Lipowsky, p. 93.

[2] I have quoted the passage (Lipowsky, pp. 25, 26) because of its resemblance to Hebbel's description of the scene.

Act IV, sc. 2: Lipowsky relates (p. 29) that it was rumoured that Agnes Bernauer had poisoned the little Prince Adolf, and he shows at some length that the charge was a base calumny. Hebbel has enlarged here; in his drama the Bavarian people attribute the death of Herzog Wilhelm and his wife as well as that of their son Adolf to Agnes's evil machinations. To this and the following point I shall have occasion to return later.

Act IV, sc. 4: Lipowsky (p. 29) states that as long as Herzog Wilhelm lived, Agnes Bernauer was safe; this may have given Hebbel the idea of making Agnes's life depend on that of Adolf.

The following passages from Lipowsky perhaps influenced Hebbel's conception of the problem of *Agnes Bernauer*; they are however of minor importance, as Hebbel already found the same idea fully treated in Törring's drama. 'Nun war die Liebesgeschichte...eine Staatsangelegenheit, wichtig genug für Baiern, und längere Nachsicht schien dem Herzog Ernst...selbst Verbrechen gegen sein Volk, gegen Baiern, zu seyn' (p. 31), and 'der Rath erklärte die Heurath...als ein Staatsverbrechen, das nur durch den Verlust ihres Lebens könnte abgebüsset werden[1]' (compare drama, Act IV, sc. 3: 'ja sogar wegen blosser Eingehung einer solchen Ehe...vom Leben zum Tode gebracht werden dürfe').

The next point is of more importance; Lipowsky (p. 27) relates that immediately after the tournament, Agnes Bernauer was publicly acknowledged Duchess of Bavaria and taken in pomp from Vohburg to Straubing. This exactly corresponds to Hebbel's Act IV, sc. 5: 'Nichts hat mich so verdrossen, als das Gepränge, mit dem er sie gleich nach dem Regensburger Tag, einer Herzogin gleich, von Vohburg nach Straubing führte,' and Agnes's speech (Act IV, sc. 7) beginning 'Was sonst? Ich seh' schon bei Tage einmal....'

In regard to the question of Agnes choosing her own grave, to which Hebbel attached so much importance ('der ganze Character liegt darin[2]'), it may be mentioned that in the 'Stiftungsurkunden' quoted by Lipowsky (pp. 150—169), reference is made to the lamp for 'ain ewigs liecht' which in the drama is the last gift Agnes is ever to ask from her husband.

Act V: Lipowsky (p. 36) is the only writer who relates that the execution was entrusted to Nusperger. This statement appears to be Lipowsky's own invention, for he mentions in a note (p. 103) that he has not been able to ascertain the names of Agnes's judges, but that

[1] Lipowsky, p. 35.
[2] Letter of Jan. 26, 1852 (*Bw.*, IV, 348).

Oeffele gives a list of Ernst's 'Räthe' in 1433, among whom are Nusperg and Degenberg; he further states (pp. 105 f.) that the former was 'Richter zu Straubing' at the time of Agnes's murder and 'da es unter der Würde eines Vitzthums von Niederbaiern war, der Vollziehung des Todesurtheils von Amtswegen beizuwohnen, und daher solches dem Richter von Straubing oblag,...so werde ich keine irrige Meinung wagen, wenn ich behaupte, dass der Vizedom von Straubing ...gar keinen Antheil an der Aburtheilung der Agnes Bernauerin hatte.' Hebbel has therefore again followed Lipowsky in a point which is that historian's invention.

Act v, sc. 8: Lipowsky also mentions (p. 40) that Albrecht allied himself with Ludwig of Ingolstadt and invaded Bavaria: 'Dörfer loderten in Flammen...und Bauern wurden...geplündert...ja selbst getödtet. Kein Feind konnte im Lande grausamer wüthen' (pp. 42—3). This is exactly what occurs in the drama. Compare especially Lipowsky, p. 38: 'so will ich...an meinem Vater, an meinem Vaterlande, und an allen, die Ursache dieses grausamen Mordes waren, schrökliche Rache nehmen,' with the beginning of scene 8.

Act v, sc. 9: Lipowsky (p. 43) relates that Albrecht is victorious and that Ernst sends to Kaiser Sigmund asking him 'ein Schreiben an seinen Sohn zu erlassen' (p. 44). Lipowsky also gives a copy of the exact instructions given by Ernst to his official for the journey (p. 175). These are important as showing that Hebbel must have been aware how widely the historical Ernst differed from his own conception of him. This point again will be discussed later: for the present it need only be noted that no other writer consulted by Hebbel mentions any interference on the part of the Emperor and that Hebbel no doubt here enlarged on Lipowsky.

B. Hebbel's Indebtedness to other Historical Works and Chronicles[1].

I. Histories of Bavaria.

The only two histories of Bavaria which can be shown to have directly influenced Hebbel's play are those to which he refers so contemptuously in the letter to Dingelstedt, namely Mannert's and Falckenstein's. Both writers devote considerable space to the murder of Agnes Bernauer and strongly censure the deed. It is to be noted that in the case of conflicting records Falckenstein is very careful to

[1] Cf. R. M. Werner's notes to *Agnes Bernauer*, *S. W.*, III, 445—478.

state all sides of the question, while Mannert as a rule only gives one version. In such a case it will be seen that Hebbel has nearly always followed Mannert.

Again I have only noted resemblances when similar passages do not occur in any other of Hebbel's sources.

1. Mannert's 'Geschichte Bayerns.'

'Personennamen.' On p. 251 of Vol. I Mannert gives a list of noble Bavarian families, from which Hebbel seems to have taken the names Seyboltsdorf and Leubolfing (Hebbel writes Läubelfing). The names Preysing and Törring also occur in the list, but are not necessarily taken from Mannert; Törring was no doubt inserted as a compliment to Graf Törring and Preising may have been taken from Törring's drama. On p. 217 Mannert mentions 'Ortenburg'; Ortenberg was the name which Hebbel gave to one of Albrecht's friends in his original MS. until the fourth act, when he substituted 'Frauenhoven.'

Mannert has not influenced the plot of the drama in the same degree as Lipowsky; as was to be expected, borrowings mainly occur in the references to Bavarian history. Curiously enough, Hebbel seems to have used Mannert almost entirely in Acts III and IV and then chiefly in the scenes between Ernst and Preising.

Act III, sc. 1: This scene is strongly influenced by Mannert; the following are the chief points: (1) 'Ich kann's nicht lassen, und es ärgert mich doch immer wieder von Neuem. Das war Baiern einst, und das ist Baiern jetzt!...Aber wie mancher alte Mann muss noch leben, der der Zeit noch recht gut gedenkt, wo Tyrol und Brandenburg und das fette Holland...unser war.' Mannert heads chapters 12, 13, 14 of Book II 'Bayerns Theilung und Sinken—Brandenburg verloren—Holland verloren'; and on p. 333 draws attention to the size of Bavaria under Kaiser Ludwig. This is obviously responsible for Ernst's retrospection. (2) '...die ganze Reihe von Thorheiten..., durch die das Alles verloren ging! Nein, wie Ihr gewirthschaftet habt!' Mannert (p. 334) also strongly blames the conduct of Kaiser Ludwig's sons, and he attributes the cause of Bavaria's decay to their stupidity and folly. Falckenstein, on the other hand, has no word of blame for Ludwig's descendants. (3) 'Kaiser Ludwig..., der Du jeden Feind bestandst, ausgenommen den letzten, heimlichen, ohne Namen und Gesicht...wenn der Giftmischer sich nicht mit Wein und Brot gegen Dich verschworen und Dich vor der Zeit ausgethan hätte!' Here Hebbel takes it for granted that Kaiser

Ludwig was poisoned. Similarly Mannert (p. 330) gives his opinion: 'dass Gift sein Leben kürzte, ist schwerlich zu bezweifeln; woher das Gift kam, weiss niemand.' Hebbel has again followed Mannert rather than Falckenstein (p. 288), who thinks it is most likely that the Emperor died a natural death.

Hebbel's conception of Ernst's character was certainly influenced by Mannert's praise of his beneficent rule (p. 469): 'Friede herrschte in seinen Bezirken...das Land erholte sich allmählich von den fürchterlichen Verwüstungen des frühern Krieges. München...hatte einen Vater an ihm gefunden;...mit dem freyen Handel wuchs Wohlhabenheit...Die Anhänglichkeit der Bürger an den Landesherrn zeigte sich weniger durch Worte als durch Handlungen.' These passages apply exactly to Hebbel's Herzog Ernst and are peculiar to Mannert among Hebbel's sources; no other writer consulted by him praises Ernst in the same degree.

Act III, sc. 6: Ernst's interview with Preising. In this scene also there are several resemblances to Mannert, again mainly in points of Bavarian history. *Preising*: 'Das wär' wohl das erste Mal, dass Herzog Wilhelm Etwas wollte, was Ew. Gnaden nicht wollen!' *Ernst*: 'Eben darum soll man ihn nie vorbei gehen!' corresponds to Mannert: 'Was dieser [Ernst] that, genehmigte Wilhelm, und er that nichts, ohne sich mit Wilhelm zu berathen' (p. 468).

Ernst's reference to the 'Kurhut' ('das hat Kaiser Rudolf durch seinen doppelten Spruch so verwickelt') is fully explained by Mannert (p. 278). In 1275 Kaiser Rudolf decided that the 'Kurwürde' belonged to Bavaria, but in 1290 conferred it on his son-in-law, the king of Bohemia. Falckenstein does not mention this. *Ernst*: '...es ist die Strafe uns'rer eig'nen Jugendsünden, dass wir gegen die unserer Kinder nachsichtig sein müssen,' corresponds exactly to Mannert (p. 470): 'Die Liebeshändel erfuhr der Vater und drückte seiner eignen Jugendzeit sich erinnernd, ein Auge zu.' On p. 457 Mannert comments on the 'Scharfsinn' of Ludwig der Höckerige of Ingolstadt; this no doubt is responsible for Hebbel's anecdote of 'der Burggraf von Nürnberg, der kleine Buckligte.' *Ernst*: '...mein Bruder soll die Ausschreibungen auf der Stelle erlassen,...das ist ein Geschäft für ihn!' may be traced to Mannert's reference to Wilhelm's 'Vorliebe zu äusserer Pracht' (p. 468).

Hebbel makes two references to Margaretha von Kärnten, the daughter-in-law of Kaiser Ludwig. In Act III, sc. 10 Preising tells Albrecht how his ancestor Ludwig, son of the Emperor, married the ugly Margaretha, heiress of Tyrol, and by this act earned the thanks of his subjects, who 'unter seiner Regierung das Salz noch einmal so billig

kauften,...und ihn...dafür segneten!' Both Falckenstein and Mannert speak of this marriage, but neither depicts Ludwig as sacrificing himself for the good of his country. On the contrary, Mannert states (p. 326) that Ludwig specially desired the marriage, as the acquisition of Tyrol would facilitate an invasion of Italy. Hebbel, who of course wished the moral to be brought home to Albrecht, perhaps built up his view of the marriage from this note (Mannert, p. 332): 'München sollte [unter Kaiser Ludwig] Mittelpunkt des Salzhandels seyn,' and Falckenstein's remark (p. 277): 'Der Sohn...bezeugte keine sonderbare Lust darzu, denn es mogte ihm eines Theils ihre unangenehme Bildung missfallen.' In the unimportant point with regard to the number of Ludwig and Margaretha's children, Hebbel has again followed Mannert in preference to Falckenstein. In Act IV, sc. 4, Preising recalls to Ernst that Barbarossa dissolved his own marriage and Ludwig der Bayer that of his son. The second statement is incorrect; not Kaiser Ludwig's son, but his future daughter-in-law (Margaretha of Kärnten, known as 'Maultasch'), was divorced by him from her first husband. It may seem curious that Hebbel, who, only a few scenes back, had referred to the same Margaretha, should have made this slip, but Hebbel considered a few anachronisms added to the 'naturalness' of an historical drama[1].

As regards the question of the divorce itself, Hebbel again follows Mannert, who states (p. 326) as a certainty: 'Kaiser Ludwig unterzog sich dem Geschäfte selbst....Er hatte gehandelt nach römischem Rechte als Kaiser,' and quotes among other examples of such a divorce the identical one cited by Hebbel: 'Friedrich I hatte sich von seiner ersten Gemahlin geschieden.' Falckenstein, on the other hand, as usual states both sides of the question (p. 279) and favours the view that the Church also sanctioned the decree.

Act IV, sc. 4: In Ernst's second interview with Preising there are two other passages which show the influence of Mannert. (1) Ernst refers to Heinrich of Landshut as 'Fuchs,' while Mannert lays emphasis on his slyness (p. 434). (2) Mannert's words 'Entfernung, Verschliessen in ein Kloster...führte nicht zum Zwecke; die einmal gültige Ehe war gültig bis zum Tode des einen Theils' must have been in Hebbel's mind when he wrote 'Hier hilft kein Kloster, nur der Tod!'

Act IV, sc. 8: Hebbel agrees with Mannert (p. 470) and differs from the other sources in stating that Albrecht was absent at a tournament when Agnes Bernauer was murdered. Mannert does not mention

[1] Letter of Dec. 2, 1858 (*Bw.*, VI, 215).

the place, but Hebbel no doubt chose Ingolstadt because of its proximity to Straubing and because he had followed Lipowsky as regards Albert's alliance with Ludwig of Ingolstadt.

2. Falckenstein's 'Geschichten des Herzogthums Bayern.'

This work does not seem to have influenced Hebbel's play as much as Mannert's. With the exception of a few minor points, almost the only scene where a direct influence can be traced, is Ernst's second interview with Preising (Act IV, sc. 5). Falckenstein (p. 461) quotes at length a passage from the *Germania Princeps*, which deals with the murder of Agnes Bernauer. The anonymous author of this work strongly condemns the deed and points out the cruelty involved in killing a beautiful and innocent girl (compare Hebbel, 'aber es ist doch entsetzlich, dass sie sterben soll, bloss weil sie schön und sittsam war'). Perhaps, he goes on to say, she had sinned through ignorance and Albrecht had obtained her consent by force (cf. Hebbel, Act V, sc. 2): *Preising*: '...warum willst Du einen Platz nicht freiwillig wieder aufgeben, den Du doch nur gezwungen einnahmst?' *Agnes*: 'Gezwungen? So also wird meine Angst...ausgelegt?' The writer then suggests that Agnes might have been kidnapped, her place of abode kept secret, and Albrecht married to someone else. In the drama Preising proposes the very same expedient to avoid the murder of Agnes and also suggests divorce, which as we have just seen may be traced to Mannert. It is to be noted that, as Falckenstein does not believe Albrecht and Agnes were married, he fully approves of the reasoning of the *Germania Princeps* and also thinks Albrecht's marriage to another would have been advisable; with Hebbel, of course, this is impossible (*Ernst*: 'ich sollte ihm das zweite Weib geben, so lange das erste noch lebte'). Falckenstein puts all the blame on Ernst's councillors, who ought to have given their master better advice and considered the consequences, for Albrecht might have gone mad or taken his life (cf. Act IV, sc. 4: 'Wird er nicht rasen und Hand an sich legen?'). Lipowsky (p. 111) gives a long quotation from Falckenstein on the death of Agnes Bernauer, including the extract from the *Germania Princeps*, and thus Hebbel might have taken all the points noted above from Lipowsky.

The very few passages in the play which can be shown to have been borrowed from Falckenstein alone are given below; they are neither important nor conclusive.

Act IV, sc. 2: Falckenstein (p. 453) refers to the divergence of

opinion on the death of Herzog Wilhelm's wife; some chronicles record that she died very shortly after her husband, others that she contracted a second marriage. In the drama the duchess dies at the same time as her husband, for Hebbel wished Agnes Bernauer to appear responsible for the deaths of several people.

Act IV, sc. 3: The *Germania Princeps*, quoted again by Falckenstein (p. 460), lays special emphasis on the fact that Ernst consulted his counsellors 'die denn einmüthig dahin stimmeten, er könne gar wohl die Bernauerin aus dem Wege räumen lassen.' Perhaps we have here the germ of Hebbel's 'rechtliches Gutachten rechtskundiger Männer[1],' especially as Adlzreiter's defence of the murder is mentioned and in the drama he is one of the three lawyers who draw up the condemnation.

Act V, sc. 6: Hebbel's account of Agnes's death seems to point to another source, for he differs in the description of her execution from all the authorities. Falckenstein as usual gives several versions (p. 460) and one of these, namely, the casting of Agnes from a bridge, comes nearest to Hebbel. There is, however, no mention of the 'Höriger' who plays such a prominent part in Hebbel's version.

Act V, sc. 10: Falckenstein (p. 463) states more definitely than Mannert that Ernst allowed Albrecht to rule over a great part of the dukedom during his lifetime. This may have influenced the abdication of Ernst in the drama, which is strictly speaking unhistorical, but it should also be remembered that as far back as 1845, when Hebbel was considering the kingship in many aspects, he came to the conclusion that any violation of the kingly power must necessarily be followed by abdication. So probably Ernst's abdication is not to be looked for in any of the sources, but is an inherent part of the 'idea.'

II. Chronicles of Augsburg.

On October 15, 1851, whilst engaged in the composition of *Agnes Bernauer*, Hebbel made notes in his diary from P. von Stetten's *Geschichte der Stadt Augsburg*, and it can be shown that he also consulted Werlich's translation of Welser's *Chronica der Stadt Augsburg*. As was to be expected, Hebbel has used these books mainly for the first two acts of the drama, where the scene is laid in Augsburg and he required local colouring.

On a careful perusal one cannot fail to be struck by the fact that Hebbel has really borrowed very little from the wealth of detail to be

[1] Cf. *Briefwechsel*, edited by Bamberg, II, 206.

found in the chronicles; thus, for example, absolutely no use is made of the lengthy and minute description of Augsburg. It will be seen that Hebbel has merely taken a few facts from the history of the town; he could get no additional information about Agnes Bernauer, for Werlich does not mention her, and Stetten relates her death in a very few words.

As Stetten and Werlich in many cases record exactly the same facts, I have first noted those passages which may have been influenced by one or the other writer.

'Personennamen.' Werlich and Stetten often refer to Marschall Pappenheim (thus Werlich, p. 168; Stetten, p. 164) and to Hermann Nördlinger, Bürgermeister of Augsburg (Werlich, pp. 164, 165; Stetten, p. 120); also the Ritter Haydeck mentioned by Hebbel in Act III, sc. 10 and Act V, sc. 8, was evidently suggested by Rudolf von Heydeck, referred to by both Werlich (p. 151) and Stetten (p. 144).

Act I, sc. 15[1]: 'Seit jenem unseligen Katharinen-Abend, wo wir den Pöbel mit in den Rath aufnehmen mussten[2].' Both Werlich and Stetten give a full account of what occurred on October 21, 1368, when the 'Zünfte' forced the patricians to admit them to a share in the government of the town.

As regards the Emperor's assent to the 'Zunftbrief' ('Kaiser und Reich hätten uns besser beistehen sollen'), Hebbel has followed Werlich alone (p. 115: 'Keyser Carl hat keine einzige Einred gehabt'), for Stetten relates (p. 117) that the consent of the Emperor was obtained with great difficulty and only after one embassy had been unsuccessful. On the other hand, the conclusion of the same speech ('Wir hatten genug zu tun, dass wir uns nur nicht selbst unter die Metzger und Handschuhmacher aufnehmen lassen...mussten') is taken from Stetten, pp. 115—116 ('Die Handwercker verlangten von den Geschlechtern, dass sie sich in ihre Zünfften begeben, und also der Geschlechters-Stand und Gesellschafft völlig aufgehoben werden solle;...allein der meiste Theil wollte sich durchaus hiezu nicht bequemen, und lieber die Stadt meiden'). This example is very typical of Hebbel's use of the sources: he does not keep to one even for a single incident, but selects from several as suits his purpose. Thus, half the Bürgermeister's speech is taken from Werlich and half from Stetten.

Act II, sc. 3 and 8: Concerning Caspar Bernauer's reference to the Vehmgericht, it is to be noted that Stetten and Werlich often mention

[1] Werlich, p. 165, and Stetten, p. 154, refer to the 'Tantz-Hauss' where the scene of Act I, scene 15, is laid.

[2] This incident was doubtless inserted to depict the disintegration of society at the close of the Middle Ages.

'das heimliche Westphälische Fehm-Gericht'; for example, Stetten (p. 161), immediately after the short notice of the death of Agnes Bernauer, relates that thirty-two citizens of Augsburg were appointed 'Schöffen und Richter des...Fehm-Gerichts.'

Act III, sc. 7: Albrecht speaks of the view from the windows of the castle of Vohburg as 'ein wahrer Lug in's Land.' It is interesting to notice that both Werlich and Stetten[1] repeatedly refer to the tower near Augsburg named on account of its height 'Lug ins Land.'

Indebtedness to Werlich alone.

I have only been able to find two passages where the influence of Werlich apart from Stetten can be traced.

Act I, sc. 16: *Frauenhoven*: 'Ist es wahr,...dass der Boden von Augsburg keine Ratten duldet?' *Bürgermeister*: 'Gewiss...Das war schon so zu den Zeiten des Drusus.' In the introduction to his work, in which he describes Augsburg, Werlich (p. 1) uses exactly the same words ('der Bodem [von Augspurg]...duldet keine Ratten'); Werlich (p. 8) and Stetten (p. 7) both mention Drusus.

Act IV, sc. 2: A peasant brings Duke Ernst a huge ear of corn. Werlich (p. 165) notes 'eine grosse Wolfeile im Getreydt' in the year 1427.

Indebtedness to Stetten alone.

'Personennamen.' I have not been able to find the name 'Knippeldollinger' in any of the sources, but Stetten (p. 137) speaks of a certain Stadtvogt Dollinger.

Act I, sc. 18: The Bürgermeister tells how his cousin Juliana Peutinger when only four years old welcomed the Emperor with a Latin speech. Stetten (p. 258) also relates this incident, but under the year 1504.

Act III, sc. 6: Ernst's reference to the blocking of the Lech—'dass er uns von den Augsburgern nicht wieder auf einen Wink des Kaisers versperrt werden kann, wie anno Neunzehn bei den Bischofhändeln!' corresponds exactly to Stetten's version. He records (p. 148) that in 1419 'hielten Hertzog Ernst und Wilhelm von Bayern...die Strassen gegen der Stadt gesperret. Dahero dann der Kayser bewogen worden, den Augspurgern zu befehlen, dass sie den Lech-Strom gleichfalls gegen Bayern schützen, schirmen und verschlagen sollen.' Werlich (p. 156)

[1] For example Stetten page 250 and Werlich page 167.

has related the incident in quite a different manner. According to him Ludwig of Bavaria blockaded the Lech against the people of Augsburg.

There remain only the two passages from Stetten, which Hebbel noted in his diary on Oct. 15, 1851.

(1) '1418 Zigeuner zuerst in Augsburg.' In Act IV, sc. 9, Agnes speaks of the gypsies passing through Straubing. (2) Hebbel notes the name Susanna Neidhart and the date 1496. Under that year Stetten describes the visit of Prince Philip to Augsburg, the dances and tournaments given in his honour and tells how the prince danced with the beautiful patrician Susanna Neidhart. This statement may have influenced the last scenes of the first act of the drama, where Albrecht meets Agnes at a dance.

One other chronicle must be noted which seems only to have influenced one sentence of Hebbel's drama. This is an anonymous translation of Veit Arnpeck's *Chronicon Boioariae.*

Act III, sc. 8: *Albrecht*: 'Agnes, hat man's Dir schon gesagt, dass der rothe Wein, wenn Du ihn trinkst durch den Alabaster Deines Halses hindurch leuchtet, als ob man ihn aus einen Kristall in den andern gösse?' The translation of Arnpeck's Latin chronicle describes Agnes Bernauer in very similar words, 'man sagt, dass sie so hübsch gewesen sey, wann sie roten wein getrunckhen hett, So hett man ihr den Wein in der khel hinab gehen sehen' (Freyberg, p. 174). A. Neumann (*Zeitschrift für deutsche Philologie,* XXX, p. 250) has shown that this passage was not contained in the original Latin, but was added by the translator, and S. Riezler[1] mentions that this was a favourite trait for the delineation of female beauty in the middle ages. As there seems to be no other point of resemblance in this chronicle to Hebbel's play and as the passage referred to occurs immediately after the mention of Agnes's burial, it is very probable that Hebbel merely read the short account of her on p. 174.

AGNES LÖWENSTEIN.

LONDON.

[1] S. Riezler, *Untersuchungen über Agnes Bernauer und die baierischen Herzoge* (*Sitzungsber. der Münchener Akademie,* XV, 1885, p. 289).

(*To be continued.*)

THE DIALECT OF THE TEXT OF THE NORTHUMBRIAN GENEALOGIES.

THE text of the Northumbrian Genealogies is edited by Dr Sweet in *The Oldest English Texts* (pp. 167—171). In his introductory remarks the editor quotes the following information about the MS. from the letter-press accompanying Plate 165 of the publications of the Palæographical Society (Part X, 1880), which gives a facsimile of part of the MS. Additions have been made to the lists in later times, but an examination of the portions due to the first hand proves that the MS. was written between the years 811 and 814. The last name in the list of popes, by the first hand, is that of Leo III, who died in 816; the last king is Coenuulf of Mercia who died in 819; and among the latest of the bishops in the different dioceses are some who succeeded about the year 811, and others who died in 814. The fact that the latest recorded succession among the kings is one of the house of Mercia, points to that kingdom as the part of England where the MS. was written. The character of the writing confirms this view, being of the same school as that of the Mercian charters of the same period. But the editor remarks: 'The fact of the royal genealogies beginning with Northumbria is an equally strong argument in favour of the assumption of a Northumbrian scribe, which is further confirmed by their being preceded by a work of the Northumbrian Bede, and the want of Northumbrian charters makes the evidence of handwriting doubtful.' In the following article an attempt will be made to solve the problem of the text's place of origin, by inquiring how far the scribe has modified the forms of names drawn from four dialectal areas, Kentish, Saxon, Mercian and Northumbrian, in the direction of his own dialect.

I. The Kentish group of names (1—4, 10—11, 111—116).

(*a*) In the Kt. names the symbols *æ* (originally for low-front-wide) and *e* (orig. for mid-front-wide) are not confused as is commonly the case in nearly all Kt. charters[1]; *æ* corresponds to W. Gmc. *a* in *iaen-* 4, *-daeg* 115, and *e* to W. Gmc. *e* in *-helm* 10, *ueg-* 115, *geb-* 10, to W. Gmc.

[1] Weightman, in *Eng. Stud.*, XXXV, 337 ff.

a-j in *ecg-* 112, and prim. O.E. *å-i* in *hengest* 114. Nothing can be inferred from the two forms *eðil-* 113 and *æðil-* 112, as the *e* of the former may be an unrounded form of *ǣ*. As early as the end of the eighth century *æ* no longer represented a pure low-front-wide sound in Kt., but a sound nearly mid-front-wide, under which it was levelled during the ninth century. Even in the earlier charters *æ*, *ę* and *e* are used indiscriminately for prim. O.E. *æ* and *e*, but not to the same extent as in the later charters. But the fact that in these Kt. names *æ* and *e* are not used indiscriminately for two originally different sounds, does not prove that the discrimination is due to a scribe in whose dialect they still possessed different phonetic values. The influence of traditional spelling would still be felt in Kt. even had the two sounds become one, which was not probably the case at the very beginning of the ninth century.

(*b*) Prim. O.E. *ǣ* (< W. Gmc. *ā*) is found in *uær-* 11, and *-red* (3). The latter invariably forms the second element of a name, and always contains *e*. It lost its stress early, its vowel consequently being shortened, but not before *ǣ* had been raised to *ē*. In the pure Kt. charters dated between 679 and 811 (Sw. *O.E.T.*) we find that *e* represents prim. O.E. *ǣ* 29 times, in *-red* 4/4 etc. (24), *uer-* 33/2, 19, *stret* 5/3, *meg-* 5/3, but *ę* in *węr-* 33/11 (d. 803), *-ręd* 33/10; *æ* (*ae*) appears three times only, once for prim. O.E. *ǣ-i* in *-maeri* 4/5, and twice for prim. O.E. *æ* lengthened after loss of *g* in *gæn-* 34/10 (d. 805). This indiscriminate use of *ae*, *ę* and *e* for prim. O.E. *ǣ* is only found elsewhere in the Merc. dialect of Ru.[1], where *æ* was probably due to Saxon influence.

(*c*) Prim. O.E. *æ*, *e*, *i* were as a rule diphthongised before certain consonant-combs. in pure Kt. In the first four pure Kt. charters there is no example of the 'breaking' of *æ* before *l*-combs., or of *e* before *r*-combs., the forms which occur being *balth-* 6/3, 7/5, *ald-* 4/5, 7/6, *-uuald* 5/5 (2), *-uualh* 7/5, *-uualla* 7/5, *berht* 4/4 etc. (14), *bern-* 4/6, 5/6. The diphthong from prim. O.E. *æ* before *r*-combs. is variously represented as *a*, *ae*, *aea* in *-hard* 4/5, 6, 7/5, *-haerd* 5/6, *-haeard* 6/3, *-iaeard* 6/4.

In the later charters (770–811). (1) *ea* from prim. O.E. *æ* before *l*-combs. is found in *uuealh-* 8/5, 34/4, *ealh-* 33/13, 35/14, *eald-* 34/4, and *ea* from *æ* before *r*-combs. in *eard-* 8/1 etc. (4), *-heard* 33/1 etc. (15), *ieard* 3/4, *geard* 35/5, 13; but *a* in *alh-* 33/5 etc. (4), *ald* 33/3 etc. (4), *-bald* 33/11, 19, *-wald* 34/4, *-waling* 35/7, and *-hard* 33/18.

(2) *eo* from O.E. *e* before *r*-combs. occurs in *beorn-* 32/2 etc. (5), *beorcol* 33/21, but *e* in *-berht* 8/4 etc. always. That *berht* never appears

as *beorht* is probably due to an early fronting of the comb. *rh*. The form *-bericht* found in the Stowe MS. of charter 5/4 (d. 700 or 715) seems to favour this view.

(3) Prim. O.E. *i* before *r*- and *h*-combs. appears as *i* in *irmin-* 4/5, *uuiht-* 5/1, 5 in the earlier charters, and as *i* in *uuiht* 8/5, 33/20, *io* in *wioht* 34/7 in the later.

In the Kt. names in our text diphthongs due to 'breaking' are, with two exceptions, distributed in the same way.

(1) *a* is written before *l*-combs. in *ald-* 10, *-wald* 2, *-bald* 113, and *ea* before *r*-combs. in *eard-* 11, *-heard* 4.

(2) *eo* in *beorn-* 11, but *e* in *berht* (always) 3 etc., and *ercon-* 112.

(3) *i* before *ht* in *wiht-* 115, but *iu* before *rm* in *iurmen-* 114.

The two exceptional forms are *ercon-* and *iurmen-*. As 'smoothing' did not take place in Kt., *ercon* must be regarded as a Merc. or North. form of prim. O.E. **eorcon*. In the Moore-MS. of Bede's *History* (*O.E.T.*, 131 ff.) it appears as *earcon-* 148 etc. (6), *ercon-* 236 etc. (4). In the L.V. names (*O.E.T.*, 153 ff.) it only occurs once, and there appears as *ercin-*. In the North. dialect, but more particularly in North-North., *eo* due to 'breaking' was lowered to *ea* (*æa*?) which in a 'smoothed' form appears as *e* (*æ*), whence *earcon-* and *ercon-* in B.H. Again the diphthong *iu* is not found in Kt. and its presence in a Kt. name is probably due to a non-Kt. scribe. In the North. dialect of L.V. *iu* is frequent.

(*d*) The absence of the diphthongisation of *e* in *geb-* after a front *g* is characteristic of Kt., Merc. and North.

(*e*) The form *diora*" is pure Kt. and may be traced back to W.Gmc. *eu* or *iu-i*, as *io* came to represent both *īo* and *ēo* in late Kt. The name also occurs in Sax.-Kt. charters as *diora* 25/11 and *diara* 30/19, both forms showing Kt. influence. In L.V. it appears as *diori*, in which prim. O.E. *īo* (< W. Gmc. *iu-i*) is preserved.

Thus the only two exceptional forms in the Kt. group of names are probably due to a Northumbrian scribe, the remaining forms being preserved unaltered.

II. The Saxon group of names (5—8, 12—25, 45—50).

(*a*) In the Sax. names there is no instance of the 'breaking' of prim. O.E. *æ* before *l*-combs.; it appears as *a* in *alh-* 22, *ald-* 24, 50, *-wald* 6, 24, *-bald* 7, 21, *-walh* 7. This might be regarded as being due

to a non-Sax. scribe, seeing that in pure W.S., at least, prim. O.E. *æ* > *ea* before *l*-combs. But on turning to other Saxon texts we find that *a* is the rule, and *ea* only the exception. In the first early Sax. charters (*O.E.T.*, 1—3) dated 692–778, in a later charter dated 847, and in the Saxon Genealogies (*O.E.T.*, 179), the MS. of which dates from the second half of the ninth century, we find *a* in *-uald* cht. 2/1, *bald-* 3/8, *alh-* 20/22, 24, *-wald* S.G. 179/5, *-bald* 179/7, 22, *-uuald* chts. 1/6, 2/1, *-bald* 1/7, 3/12 but *ea* in *ealh-* S.G. 179/3 only. There is therefore no reason for attributing *a* in our text to a Merc. or North. scribe. Besides, in the second elements of compound words *ea* > *a* (*o*) even in pure W.S. through want of stress.

(*b*) In the forms *ercon-* 6 and *-haeh* 6 (from the names of two East-Saxon bishops) 'smoothing' of *eo* and *ēa* has apparently taken place. In the only two East-Saxon charters edited in *O.E.T.*, we find the three forms *ercn-* 1/6 (d. 692–3), *-sex-* 1/1, and *-sęx-*, all showing 'smoothing,' *eo* > *e* before *rc*, and *ea* > *e*, *ę* before *c*(*s*). One is, therefore, justified in assuming that the forms *ercon-* and *-haeh* are pure East-Saxon. The development of 'smoothing' in this Saxon patois may have been due to Merc. influence. In a Kt. charter d. 803, *æðelhaeh* 33/6, the name of a Mercian keeps its pure Merc. form. In L.V. *-hēah* appears as *-hech* 68, and *-haeg* 372.

The preservation of *io* in *uuiohthun*, the name of a South-Saxon bishop, is probably due to traditional spelling. The same bishop's name appears as *uuihthun* in a Kt. charter (33 d. 803). Before *ht*, *io* had become *i* in most dialects (in W.S. *wio* > *wu*) by the beginning of the ninth century. *Uuict* or *uuiht* is always the spelling in L.V. and B.H.

(*c*) The continental forms *agil-* 17 and *leutherius* 18 are left unaltered. In L.V. *agil-* is always *egil-*.

(*d*) The spelling *o͞e* (< *ō-i*) in *coen-* 7 is not due to a non-Saxon scribe, for it occurs in the two East-Saxon charters mentioned under II. *b*.

There is therefore no form among the Saxon names, which cannot be shown to be characteristic of other Saxon texts.

III. The Mercian group of names (26—41, 91—110, 117—121).

The Merc. names exhibit on the whole the same developments as the forms which occur in Merc. charters (*O.E.T.*, 9—16, 46—8).

(*a*) Prim. O.E. *æ* (< W. Gmc. *a* isolatively treated) remains in *æsc-* 28, *caed-* 108, as also in *iaen-* cht. 46/1, and *aet*, *waes*, *ðæt*, *ðæs* etc. 47 (d. 846).

(*b*) Prim. O.E. *æ* (< W. Gmc. *a-i*) is spelt *ae* and *e* in *æðil-* 29, 91, *eðil-* 118, *uuæren-* 40. The forms *aethil-*, *ęðil-*, *edil-* cht. 9 (d. 736) also show this same confusion of symbols. In the same way *ae* and *e* are used in the forms *aelf-* 30, *cueld-* 108, for prim. O.E. *æ* before *l* + combinations + *i*. In chts. 13/5, 15/6, and 16/5 *aelf-* only is found.

(*c*) W. Gmc. *ā* which was fronted to *ē* in Merc. is found in *uuer-* 30, 94 and *-red* 40. The first form is also spelt *uuær-* 94. The charters have *e* in *uer-* 15/6, 16/5, *-red* 10/1 (*réd*), 3, 46/6, *legeo* 10/2, and *werun* (pret. pl.) 48/17, but *æ* in *-flæd* 13/5. In the form *raeð-* 47/3 *ae* represents *ē* (< *ō-i*). In the Merc. dialect of Ru.[1] also prim. O.E. *ǣ* (< W. Gmc. *ā*) is written *ae* and *e*. In North. texts the symbols are never confused.

(*d*) *Ceadda* (beside *caed-*) with the diphthongisation of prim. O.E. *æ* after front *c* is a regular Merc. development as is shown by similar forms in Ru.[1]

(*e*) In the following forms the diphthongs have been 'smoothed' (1) *ea* > *ae* before *c*(*s*) in *saex-* 35 etc. (3), (2) *ēa* > *āē* before *g*(*h*) in *-laeg* 95, (3) *eo* > *e* before *rh* in *berht* 24 etc. (14), (4) *io* > *i* before *h* in *uiht-* 95, (5) *īo* > *ī* before *h* in *-uuih* 98. In the charters the forms with diphthongs are numerous (1) *ea* > *ae* before *c*(*s*) in *saex-* 11/2 (d. 767), and *e* before *rg* in *hergae* 11/2, (2) *ēa* remains before *h* in *-leah*, *-lea* 47/2, (3) *eo* > *e* before *c*(*s*) in *sex* 47/15, before *rc* in *bercol* 9/7, and before *rh* in *berht* (50). In *beorg* the diphthong remains. (4) *ĭo* > *ĭ* before *h* in *uuiht-* (4), and *bituih* 11/2, but remains in *uuioht* (2) and *uueoht* (1).

(*f*) In Merc. back-umlaut was more fully developed than in the other dialects. In these names, however, we find *al*(*u*)- 98 and *waðol-* 95, by the side of *heaðo-* 28, *headda* 36, and *friоð*(*u*)- 110. In the same way *heaðo-* and *haðo-* occur together in the charters.

The only non-Merc. forms are *-geot* 94 etc. (5), *eost-* 117, and *eamer* 93, which are probably due to a North. scribe. In the South-North. dialect of L.V. and Ru.[2] W. Gmc. *au* apparently became *ēo*, whence *-geot* for W.S. *gēat* and *eost-* for *ēast*, while prim. O.E. *e* before 'breaking' combs. became *ea* regularly in North-North. and sporadically in South-North., whence *eamer* for *ēomer* < **eoh-mær-*.

IV. The Northumbrian group of names (42—44, 51—69, 72—90).

(*a*) In North. prim. O.E. *æ* remains, as here in *blaec-* 90, *-daeg* 76; *eðil-* (3) may be another form of *aeðil-* (2) and not of *ēeðil-* (1). In L.V. *eðil-* is the usual form.

(*b*) W. Gmc. *ā* regularly gives *ē* in North. as in *sueb-* 75, *bel-* 82, and *-red.* The symbol *æ* is not found at all.

(*c*) In the South-North. dialect, as we have seen, W. Gmc. *au* became *ēo* (*ǣo*?). In these names *ean-* 3, *ead-* (3), *eat-* (1), *frea-* (2), and *eata* (3) are spelt with *ea*, but *eota* (1), and *-geot* (2) with *eo.* In the L.V. names, also, *ea* is far more numerous than *eo.* It is only in Ru.^{2}, that *eo* becomes the regular symbol.

(*d*) In North. *īo* (< Gmc. *eu-i*) was not levelled under *ēo* (< Gmc. *eu*) as in Merc. and W.S., hence *io* in *liod-* 87 is correct North.

(*e*) In *peht-* 68(2), and *-berht* (11) the diphthongs have been 'smoothed' as in regular North. In the form *-wio-* (< **wīh*) 79 *h* perhaps disappeared before the 'smoothing' period.

(*f*) The forms *heaðo-*, *bead(u)-*, *frioðo-* (2) show back-umlaut of prim. O.E. *æ* and *i*, but in *alusa* and *uestor-* the diphthong is wanting.

All these forms are therefore regular North.

The results yielded by this analysis of the forms of the names are:

(*a*) The scribe preserved the native dialectal forms of most of the names unmodified.

(*b*) The North. forms *-geot*, *eost-* and *eamer* in Merc. names point to Northumbria as the locality where the list was compiled.

(*c*) The theory of the North. authorship of the list is corroborated, firstly by the occurrence of the diphthong *iu* in one Kt. name, and of the 'smoothing' of *eo* in another, secondly by the retention of *īo* in the Kt. name *diora*, and in the Merc. name *crioda*, and thirdly by the normal character of the North. names.

O. T. Williams.

Bangor.

DRUMMOND OF HAWTHORNDEN AND THE POETS OF THE PLÉIADE.

In an article on *The Scottish Sonneteers and the French Poets*, in the *Modern Language Review* (Oct., 1907), I showed that Drummond of Hawthornden had borrowed the matter of a large number of his sonnets from those of the French poet Desportes[1]. I was then under the impression that, in spite of his acquaintance with the works of several other French poets of the second half of the sixteenth century, Drummond did not appear to have been directly influenced by them. However a closer investigation has established the fact that the Scottish poet likewise drew on the works of more than one poet of the Pléiade. In view of Drummond's debt to Desportes, I could not persuade myself that he owed nothing to Ronsard in particular. I have accordingly gone through again, and carefully compared his sonnets with those of the chief of the Pléiade, and although the Scotchman naturally proceeds with even more than usual wariness, there can be no doubt that several of his sonnets present refashionings of certain sonnets of his famous predecessor, whose works were well known to Drummond, the *Amours*, the *Franciade*, the *Hymnes* and other of his works figuring among the lists of books read which Drummond was wont to draw up between 1606 and 1614.

Sonnet XIII reproduces, with some variations in the phraseology, Sonnet LIV of *Amours*, I:

O sacred blush, impurpling cheek's pure skies
With crimson wings which spread thee like the morn;

O doux parler dont les mots doucereux
Sont engravés au fond de ma memoire!

[1] It may be added that the opening lines of Sonnet XII of *The Second Part* of Drummond's *Poems* are translated from the fifth sonnet of Desportes *Regrets Funèbres sur la Mort de Diane*, and that the piece included in the *Miscellanies* under the rubric *Regret* is an adaptation, in a different form, of the twenty-third sonnet of *Cléonice* (ed. Michiels, p. 190).

O bashful look, sent from those shining eyes,
Which, though cast down on earth, couldst heaven adorn;
O tongue, in which most luscious nectar lies,
That can at once both bless and make forlorn;
Dear coral lip, which beauty beautifies,
That trembling stood ere that her words were born;
And you her words, words, no, but golden chains,
Which did captive mine ears, ensnare my soul,
Wise image of her mind, mind that contains
A power, all power of senses to control;
Ye all from love dissuade so sweetly me,
That I love more, if more my love could be.

O front, d'Amour le trofée et la gloire,
O doux sourcis, ô baisers savoureux!
O cheveux d'or, ô coustaux plantureux
De lis, d'œillets, de porphyre et d'yvoire!
O feux jumeaux, d'où le ciel me fit boire
A si longs traits le venin amoureux!
O vermeillons! ô perlettes encloses!
O diamants! ô lis pourprés de roses!
O chant qui peut les plus durs émouvoir,
Et dont l'accent dans les âmes demeure.
Eh! dea! beautés, reviendra jamais l'heure
Qu'entre mes bras je vous puisse ravoir?

Sonnet XXXVII ('Of Cytherea's birds, that milk-white pair') is clearly suggested by a similar composition on the same theme in Ronsard's *Amours*, II, No. LXII ('Que dis-tu, que fais-tu, pensive tourterelle?').

The beautiful Sonnet XLVI offers a good example of how Drummond could transform a colourless canvas into a glowing picture:

Alexis, here she stay'd; among these pines,
Sweet hermitress, she did alone repair;
Here did she spread the treasure of her hair,
More rich than that brought from the Colchian mines.
She set her by these musked eglantines,
The happy place the print seems yet to bear;
Her voice did sweeten here thy sugar'd lines,
To which winds, trees, beasts, birds, did lend their ear.
Me here she first perceived, and here a morn
Of bright carnations did o'erspread her face;
Here did she sigh, here first my hopes were born,
And I first got a pledge of promis'd grace:
But ah! what serv'd it to be happy so,
Sith passed pleasures double but new woe?

Voicy le bois que ma saincte Angelette
Sur le printemps anima de son chant;
Voicy les fleurs où son pied va marchant,
Lorsque, pensive, elle s'ébat seulette;
Io, voicy la prée verdelette
Qui prend vigueur de sa main la touchant,
Quand pas à pas, pillarde, va cherchant
Le bel émail de l'herbe nouvelette.
Icy chanter, là pleurer je la vy
Icy sourire, et là je fu ravy
De ses beaux yeux par lesquels je des-vie;
Icy s'asseoir, là je la vy danser:
Sus le mestier d'un si vague penser
Amour ourdit les trames de ma vie.

This indeed is the best kind of imitation, the imitation or rather assimilation of the kind the Pléiade preached, but which they did not always practise.

The indebtedness of Drummond to Ronsard is further illustrated by Sonnet XLVIII, which reproduces, with certain variations, Sonnet XII of *Amours Diverses*:

Hair, precious hair which Midas' hand did strain,
Part of the wreath of gold that crowns these brows
Which winter's whitest white in whiteness stain,
And lily, by Eridan's bank that grows;

Hair, fatal present, which first caus'd my woes,
When loose ye hang like Danae's golden rain,
Sweet nets, which sweetly do all hearts enchain,
Strings, deadly strings, with which Love bends his bows,
How are ye hither come? tell me, O hair,
Dear armelet, for what thus were ye given?
I know a badge of bondage I you wear,

Yet hair, for you, O that I were a heaven!
Like Berenice's lock that ye might shine,
But brighter far, about this arm of mine.

Doux cheveux, doux présent de ma douce maistresse,
Doux liens qui liez ma douce liberté,

Doux filets où je suis doucement arresté,

Qui pourriez adoucir d'un Scythe la rudesse;
Cheveux, vous ressemblez à ceux de la princesse,
Qui eurent pour leur grace un astre merité;
Cheveux dignes d'un temple et d'immortalité,
Et d'estre consacrez à Vénus la déesse.

Je ne cesse, cheveux, pour mon mal appaiser,
De vous voir et toucher, baiser et rebaiser,
Vous parfumer de musc, d'ambre gris et de bâme
Et de vos nœuds crespez tout le col m'enserrer,
Afin que, prisonnier, je vous puisse asseurer
Que les liens du col sont les liens de l'ame.

Again the sonnet entitled *An Epitaph of one named Margaret* (Ward, II, 180) is based on *Amours*, I, No. CLXXXIX; the subject is identical, and the same allusion to the double meaning of Margaret is found.

A few additional examples may be instanced from the *Epigrams*. Drummond had probably more than a passing acquaintance with the poets of the Greek Anthology. However, he does not appear to have had recourse to them frequently or even directly. In reference to Drummond's epigram, entitled *The Trojan Horse* (*Poems*, I, 149), W. C. Ward remarks that there is an epigram on this topic by Antiphilus of Byzantium (*Anth. Pal.*, II, 30), but that it bears little or no resemblance to Drummond's. It has been suggested by the same writer that possibly the epigram on *Craton's Death* (*Poems*, I, 164) was prompted by a like composition of Julianus the Egyptian in the same

collection (*Anth. Pal.*, I, 386), but Drummond's source is evidently the following version of the epigram of Julianus by Ronsard:

Amidst the waves profound,
Far, far from all relief,
The honest fisher, Craton, ah! is drowned
Into his little skiff;
The boards of which did serve him for a bier,
So that to the black world when he came near,
Of him no waftage greedy Charon got,
For he in his own boat
Did pass that flood by which the gods do swear.

Berteau le pescheur s'est noyé
En sa nacelle poissonniere,
Dont le bois fut tout employé

A faire les aiz de sa biere;
De Charon la main nautonniere

Ne prit argent de ce Berteau,

Comme ayant passé la riviere
Des morts en son propre bateau.

I am inclined to think that Ronsard was also the direct source of the piece beginning 'What course of life should wretched mortals take?' (*Poems*, II, 155). This piece appeared originally in Philipps's edition of the *Poems*, under the title 'A Translation of S. John Scot his verses, beginning: Quod vitae sectabor iter.' The original[1] is obviously the well-known epigram attributed to Posidippus (*Anth. Pal.*, II, 71). Sir John Scot's elegy is a very free paraphrase of the same epigram, extending the ten verses of Greek into thirty-eight of Latin, so that Philipps's rubric can hardly be a true indication of Drummond's model, whereas Ronsard's version (*Œuvres*, ed. Blanchemain, VI, 409) contains but twenty-two, and agrees closely in its phraseology with that of Drummond.

But it is not only in the sonnets and shorter pieces that Drummond is indebted to Ronsard; indeed his debt is much greater in the longer poems. *Forth Feasting*[2], one of the longest of the Scottish poet's compositions, is constructed in great part on the pattern of the opening poem, addressed to Henry III of France, of the *Bocage Royal* (*Œuvres*,

[1] It is prettily translated by Philip Ayres (1638–1712), in Saintsbury's *Minor Poets of the Caroline Period*, II, 343. The reply by Metrodorus to this epigram, asserting the contrary in every particular, is translated in the *Arte of English Poesie* (Bk III, ch. 19), attributed to Puttenham, and also by Philip Ayres. The Greek original can be found conveniently on p. 299 of the new edition of J. W. Mackail's *Select Epigrams from the Greek Anthology*, London, 1906.

[2] Prof. John Purves (*Athenæum*, Feb. 11, 1905) points out that Drummond probably derived the title of this piece from Marino's *Tebro Festante*, a panegyric and congratulatory poem on the election of Leo XI, which appears to have been issued for the first time in the *Nuove Poesie* of Marino (1614). Considering Drummond's large debt to Marino, this may be readily admitted; but that he borrowed no more than the title is at once obvious to anyone who chooses to read the two compositions, which bear no resemblance to each other either in form or matter. (Cf. p. 98 of Menghini's *Vita ed Opere di Giambattista Marino*, Rome, 1888.)

III, 265); several passages in fact follow the French text at no great distance, and generally in a condensed form, such as the following:

When years thee vigour gave, O then how clear
Did smother'd sparkles in bright flames appear!
Amongst the woods to force a flying hart,
To pierce the mountain wolf with feather'd dart,
See falcons climb the clouds, the fox ensnare,
Outrun the wind-outrunning daedal hare,
To loose a trampling steed alongst a plain,
And in meand'ring gyres him bring again,
The press thee making place, were vulgar things;
In admiration's air, on glory's wings,
O! thou far from the common pitch didst rise,
With thy designs to dazzle envy's eyes:
Thou sought'st to know this All's eternal source,
Of ever-turning heavens the restless course,
Their fixed eyes, their lights which wand'ring run,
Whence moon her silver hath, his gold the sun;
If destine be or no, if planets can

By fierce aspects force the free-will of man;
The light and spiring fire, the liquid air,
The flaming dragons, comets with red hair,
Heaven's tilting lances, artillery, and bow,
Loud-sounding trumpets, darts of hail and snow,
The roaring element with people dumb,

The earth, with what conceiv'd is in her womb,
What on her moves, were set unto thy sight,
Till thou didst find their causes, essence, might:
But unto nought thou so thy mind didst strain,
As to be read in man, and learn to reign,

A forcer par les bois un cerf au front ramé,
Enferrer un sanglier de defenses armé,

Voir levreter le lièvre à la jambe pelue,

Voir pendre les faucons au milieu de la nue,
Faire d'un pied leger poudroyer les sablons,
Voir bondir par les prez l'enflure des ballons;
A porter le harnois, à courir la campagne,

A donter sous le frein un beau genet d'Espaigne,
A sauter, à luitter d'un bras fort et vouté:
Voilà les ferremens trenchans l'oisiveté.
.....

Il a voulu sçavoir ce que peut la nature,
Et de quel pas marchoit la première closture
Du ciel, qui tournoyant se resuit en son cours,
Et du soleil, qui fait le sien tout au rebours.
Il a voulu sçavoir des planètes les danses,
Tours, aspects et vertus, demeures et distances;
Il a voulu sçavoir les cornes du croissant,

Comme d'un feu bastard il se va remplissant,
Second Endymion amoureux de la lune.

Il a voulu sçavoir que c'estoit que Fortune,
Que c'estoit que Destin, si les influxions

Des astres commandoient à nos complexions.
Puis, descendant plus bas sous le second estage,
Il a cognu du feu la nature volage,

Il a pratiqué l'air, combien il est subtil,

Comme il est nourrissier de ce monde fertil,
Comme il est imprimé de formes differentes.

To know the weight and Atlas of a crown,
To spare the humble, proudlings pester down.
When from those piercing cares which thrones invest,
As thorns the rose, thou wearied wouldst thee rest,
With lute in hand, full of celestial fire,
To the Pierian groves thou didst retire:

There, garlanded with all Urania's flowers,
In sweeter lays than builded Thebes' towers,
Or them which charm'd the dolphins in the main,
Or which did call Eurydice again,
Thou sung'st away the hours, till from their sphere
Stars seem'd to shoot, thy melody to hear.
The god with golden hair, the sister maids,
Left nymphal Helicon, their Tempe's shades,
To see thine isle, here lost their native tongue,
And in thy world-divided language sung.

Il a cognu la foudre et ses flèches errantes
D'un grand bruit par le vague, et si le soleil peint
L'arc au ciel en substance, ou s'il apparoist feint.
Puis il a fait passer son esprit sous les ondes,
A cognu de Tethys les abysmes profondes,
Et du vieillard Protée a conté les troupeaux.
Il a cognu le flot et le reflot des eaux;

Si la lune a credit sur l'element humide,

Ou si l'ame de l'eau d'elle-mesme se guide,
Eslançant son esprit des terres à l'entour
Pour ne vivre en paresse et croupir en sejour.
Puis, venant sur la terre, a visité les villes,
Les hommes et leurs mœurs et leurs reigles civilles,
Pour sçavoir à son peuple en vertus esclairer,
Pour luy lascher la bride ou pour la luy serrer,
Cognoissant par effect toutes vertus morales.
Puis, entrant sous la terre aux caves infernales,
A cherché les métaux, et, d'esprit diligent
Cognu comme se fait l'or, le plomb et l'argent,
Quelle humeur les engendre ès veines de la terre,
Et le cuivre et le fer, instrument de la guerre.
Puis d'un si haut travail se voulant soulager,
Et d'un docte laurier ses tempes ombrager,
Prenant le luth en main qui dextrement me guide,
Se va seul recréer en l'antre Pieride,
Toutes les fleurs d'Euterpe attachant à son front.
Apollon, qui l'escoute, et les Muses, qui vont
Dansant autour de luy, l'inspirent de leur grace,
Soit qu'il vueille tourner une chanson d'Horace,
Soit qu'il vueille chanter en accords plus parfaits
Les gestes martiaux que luy-mesmes a faits.

Another of the Scottish poet's longest and finest pieces, *An Hymn of the Fairest Fair*, may be called an amplification of the French poet's *Hymne de l'Éternité* (*Œuvres*, v, p. 13), whole passages being little more than translations:

Grant me, time's Father, world-containing King,
A pow'r, of thee in pow'rful lays to sing,
That as thy beauty in earth lives, heaven shines,
So it may dawn or shadow in my lines.

As far beyond the starry walls of heaven,
As is the loftiest of the planets seven
Sequestered from this earth, in purest light,
Outshining ours, as ours doth sable night,
Thou, all-sufficient, omnipotent,
Thou ever-glorious, most excellent,

God various in names, in essence one,

High art installed on a golden throne,
Outreaching heaven's wide vasts, the bounds of nought,
Transcending all the circles of our thought:
With diamantine sceptre in thy hand

There thou giv'st laws, and dost this world command,
This world of concords rais'd unlikely sweet,
Which like a ball lies prostrate to thy feet.
.....
.....not far from thy right side,

With curled locks Youth ever doth abide;
Rose-cheeked Youth, who, garlanded with flowers
Still blooming, ceaselessly unto thee pours
Immortal nectar in a cup of gold,
That by no darts of ages thou grow old,
And, as ends and beginnings thee not claim,
Successionless that thou be still the same.
Near to thy other side resistless Might

From head to foot in burnish'd armour dight

Donne-moy donc de grâce, immense Éternité,
Pouvoir de raconter ta grande déité;
.....

Afin que ma chanson soit vive autant de jours,
Qu'eternelle tu vis sans voir finir ton cours;
.....
Tout au plus haut du ciel dans un thrône doré
Tu te sieds en l'habit d'un manteau coloré
De pourpre rayé d'or, duquel la broderie
De tous costés s'esclatte en riche pierrerie,
Et là, tenant au poing un sceptre adamantin,
Tu ordonnes tes loix au severe Destin,
Qu'il n'ose outrepasser, et que luy-mesme engrave
Fermes au front du ciel, car il est ton esclave,
Faisant tourner sous toy les neuf temples voûtez
Qui dedans et dehors cernent de tous costez,
Sans rien laisser ailleurs, tous les membres du monde
Qui gist dessous tes pieds comme une boule ronde.
A ton dextre costé la Jeunesse se tient,
Jeunesse au chef crespu, de qui la tresse vient
Flottant jusqu'aux talons par ondes non tondue,
Et luy frappe le dos en fils d'or estendue.

Ceste belle Jeunesse au teint vermeil et franc,
D'une boucle d'azur ceinte dessur le flanc,
Dans un vase doré te donne de la destre
A boire du nectar, à fin de te faire estre

Tousjours saine et disposte, et à fin que ton front
Ne soit jamais ridé comme les nostres sont.
Elle de main senestre, avec grande rudesse,

That rings about him, with a waving brand
And watchful eye, great sentinel doth stand;
That neither time nor force in aught impair
Thy workmanship, nor harm thine empire fair,
Soon to give death to all again that would
Stern discord raise, which thou destroy'd of old;
Discord, that foe to order, nurse of war,

By which the noblest things demolish'd are;
But, caitiff, she no treason doth devise,

When might to nought doth bring her enterprise,
Thy all-upholding Might her malice reins,
And her in hell throws bound in iron chains.

Repousse l'estomac de la triste Vieillesse,

Et la chasse du ciel à coups d'espée, à fin
Que le ciel ne vieillisse et qu'il ne prenne fin.
A ton autre costé la Puissance éternelle

Se tient debout plantée, armée à la mammelle
D'un corselet gravé qui luy couvre le sein,
Branslant de nuict et jour un espieu dans la main,
Pour garder seurement les bords de ton empire,
Ton regne et ta richesse, à fin que rien n'empire
Par la suite des ans, et pour donner la mort
A quiconque voudroit ramener le Discord,
Discord ton ennemy, qui ses forces assemble
Pour faire mutiner les elemens ensemble
A la perte du monde et de ton doux repos,
Et voudroit, s'il pouvoit, r'engendrer le Chaos.
Mais tout incontinent que cet ennemy brasse
Trahison contre toy, la Vertu le menasse,
Et l'envoye là bas aux abysmes d'enfer
Garrotté pieds et mains de cent chaisnes de fer.

In the long fragment entitled *The Shadow of the Judgment* Ronsard's sixth hymn *De la Justice* (*Œuvres*, v, 107) is laid under contribution for the complaint of Justice to the King of Ages; although in this instance the resemblance in particulars is slight, yet parallel passages could be quoted which are also close renderings. Lastly it may be pointed out that the *Pastoral Elegy on the Death of Sir Anthony Alexander* owes something to the sixth eclogue of Ronsard, more particularly in the concluding lines, and that the *Entertainment of the High and Mighty Monarch, Prince Charles* contains several reminiscences of the first piece in the same collection, except that for Ronsard's description of the beauties of France, Drummond substitutes a corresponding passage on Scotland and Scottish character which Buchanan had introduced in his *Epithalamium* in honour of Francis of Valois and Mary Stuart (*Sylvae*, IV).

This repeated recurrence on the part of Drummond to the works of

a poet whose star had long set in his own land may seem strange at first sight. However, it must be remembered that when the young Scot was first in France the fame of Ronsard, though declining, was still a power, and that Malherbe had not yet established in the world of letters that ascendancy which after a short struggle he was destined to maintain for many years. Moreover, although the case of Drummond is in all probability an isolated phenomenon in English literature—the height of Ronsard's popularity in England coinciding with the last two decades of the sixteenth century—the same cannot be said of other countries. In Germany and Holland more especially, and to a lesser degree in Italy, the works of the chief of the Pléiade were read eagerly and imitated during the whole time that Drummond was writing poetry, and when Ronsard's writings, in his own native land, were perused only by a few conservative country gentlemen. Opitz, both in theory and practice, took him as his chief model[1] in his attempt to reform German poetry; a large number of passages in the *Buch von der deutschen Poeterey* are copied verbatim from Ronsard's *Art Poétique* or from his prefaces to the *Franciade*, and a still larger proportion of his poems are translations or paraphrases of his French predecessor's work, while others are skilfully tessellated with passages culled here and there from Ronsard's poetry. P. Melissus, G. R. Weckherlin, and other poets of the group of German writers associated with Opitz, were also fervent admirers of the 'grand Vendômois.' In Holland, D. Heinsius in his *Nederduytsche Poëmata* (1618) frequently imitated the same model. In so doing he was following the example set by his predecessors Spieghel, van der Noot, and Jan van Hout who as early as 1575 had composed fluent verses in the same manner. In Italy, during the vogue of Marinism, Marino himself borrowed the matter of more than one of his poems from the same source, and Ronsard was the only modern foreign poet, besides Garcilaso de la Vega, for whom the admiring Italian found a niche in his *Galleria*.

We will now return to our main topic, and proceed to investigate Drummond's indebtedness to another member of Ronsard's group, namely, Pontus de Tyard, one of the lesser stars of the Pléiade, and the author of the *Erreurs Amoureuses* (1549–1554), a collection of sonnets with a few miscellaneous pieces interspersed, of which Drummond is known to have had a copy on his shelves[2]. Apart

[1] See Richard Beckherrn, *M. Opitz, P. Ronsard und D. Heinsius*, Königsberg, 1888.

[2] Pontus de Tyard was also one of Mary Queen of Scots favourite French poets; her library contained a copy of the *Erreurs Amoureuses*.

from the importance in the history of French literature of the date of Tyard's collection, the first book of which appeared at the close of 1549 a few months after Du Bellay's *Olive*, it has little to recommend it to the lover of poetry. The verse is invariably dull and not infrequently intricate and even obscure. Thus it is difficult to understand how Drummond came to be attracted by the French poet's work; possibly the explanation is to be found in that combination of philosophic thought and spiritual love which Pontus de Tyard had imbibed from the *Délie* of Maurice Scève, and which he further reinforced by studying and translating the *Dialoghi di Amore* of Leo Hebraeus. However, Drummond borrowed only very sparingly and discreetly from the author of the *Erreurs*, and not wholesale as he did from Desportes. Sonnet XLV of Drummond (ed. Ward, I, 86) is a close adaptation of Sonnet XI of the Third Book of the *Erreurs Amoureuses*, which is quoted according to Marty-Laveaux (*Œuvres Poétiques de Pontus de Tyard*, Paris, 1875). It need hardly be pointed out that, as is nearly invariably the case, the conveyance is executed with Drummond's usual felicity:

Are these the flow'ry banks, is this the mead,
Where she was wont to pass the pleasant hours?
Did here her eyes exhale mine eyes' salt show'rs,
When on her lap I laid my weary head?
Is this the goodly elm did us o'erspread,
Whose tender rind, cut out in curious flow'rs
By that white hand, contains those flames of ours?
Is this the rustling spring us music made?
Deflourish'd mead, where is your heavenly hue?
Bank, where that arras did you late adorn?
How look ye, elm, all withered and forlorn?
Only, sweet spring, nought altered seems in you;
But while here chang'd each other thing appears,
To sour your streams take of mine eyes these tears.

Sont-ce ces prez où ma Déesse affable
Comme Diane allaigrement troussée,
Chantoit un chant de ma peine passée,
Et s'en rendoit soy-même pitoyable?
Est-ce cest Orme, où d'un riz aimable,
Disant, A dieu gloire de ma pensée,
Mignardement à mon col enlacée,
Elle me fut d'vn baiser fauorable?
Et deà, où est (ô prez defleurez) donq
Le beau tappiz, qui vous ornoit adonq?
Et l'honneur gay (Orme) de ta verdure?
Languissez vous pour ma Nymphette absente?
Donques sa veuë est elle assez puissante,
Pour, comme moy, vous donner nourriture?

Again Sonnet XXVII of Drummond is manifestly written on the pattern of the opening sonnet of the Second Book of the French poet's sonnet-cycle:

That I so slenderly set forth my mind,
Writing I wot not what in ragged rhymes,
And charg'd with brass into these golden times,
When others tower so high, am left behind;
I crave not Phoebus leave his sacred cell
To bind my brows with fresh Aonian bays;
Let them have that who tuning sweetest lays
By Tempe sit, or Aganippe's well;
Nor yet to Venus' tree do I aspire,

Sith she for whom I might affect that praise,
My best attempts with cruel words gainsays,
And I seek not that others me admire.
Of weeping myrrh the crown is which I crave,
With a sad cypress to adorn my grave.

Ie n'atten point que mon nom l'on escriue
Au rang de ceux, qui ont des rameaux vers
Du blond Phébus les sçauans frons couuers,
Hors du danger de l'oublieuse riue.
Sceve parmi les doctes bouches viue:
Reste Romans honoré par les vers
De Desautelz: & chante l'Vniuers
Le riche loz de l'Immortelle Oliue:
Vueille Apollon du double mont descendre,
Pour rendre grace à cest autre Terpandre,
Qui renouuelle & l'vne, & l'autre Lyre.
Mais moy, scez tu à quoy, Dame, i'aspire?
C'est sanz espoir de piteuse te rendre
Que seulement mes plains tu daignes lire.

Instead of adopting Tyard's rather prosy enumeration of some of his poetic friends, Drummond replaces the second quatrain and the first tercet by an amplification of the first quatrain of the next sonnet in which the same theme is elaborated:

Ie n'ay encor de la sainte eau sceu boire
Dessouz le pied du prompt cheual des Cieux:
Ny le douz songe ha repu mes deux yeux
Au double mont, des filles de Memoire.

A piece entitled *Épigramme* (*Œuvres Poétiques*, p. 24) gives Drummond a start for Sonnet XXXIV, the opening lines being an almost literal translation:

O cruel beauty, meekness inhumane,
That night and day contend with my desire,
And seek my hope to kill, not quench my fire,
By death, not balm, to ease my pleasant pain.

Beauté cruelle, & douceur inhumaine,
Qui guerroyez sans cesse en mon désir,
Pour esbranler l'espoir du desplaisir
Qui me trauaille en si plaisante peine.

Lastly Sonnet XLVII is clearly suggested by the following sonnet of the *Erreurs Amoureuses* (*Œuvres Poétiques*, p. 111):

O Night, clear night, O dark and gloomy day!
O woful waking! O soul-pleasing sleep!

O calme nuit, qui doucement composes
En ma faveur l'ombre mieux animée,

O sweet conceits which in my brains did creep,
Yet sour conceits which went so soon away!
A sleep I had more than poor words can say,
For, closed in arms, methought, I did thee keep;
A sorry wretch plung'd in misfortunes deep
Am I not, wak'd, when light doth lies bewray?
O that that night had ever still been black!
O that that day had never yet begun!

And you, mine eyes, would ye no time saw sun,
To have your sun in such a zodiac!
Lo! what is good of life is but a dream,
When sorrow is a never-ebbing stream.

Qu'onques Morphée en sa sale enfumée,
Peignit du rien de ses Metamorphoses!
Combien heureux les œillets, & les roses

Ceingnoient le bras de mon ame espamée,
Affriandant une langue affamée

Du Paradis de deux leures descloses!

Lors que Phébus, laissant sa molle couche,
Se vint moquer de mes bras, de ma bouche,
Et de sa sœur, la lumière fourchuë!

Ah, que boiteux d'une poussiue haleine
Soient ses cheuaux, & ne cueille sa peine
Qu'vn fruit amer de la vierge branchue.

From the other associates of Ronsard Drummond does not appear to have taken much. The seventh sonnet of the *Second Part* of the *Poems* ('O! it is not to me, bright lamp of day') is manifestly written on the model of a sonnet of Baïf's *Amours de Francine* ('Las! ny pour moy les zefirs ne ventellent').

Last of all attention may be drawn to the curious device employed on two occasions by Drummond—once in Sonnet LI of the *Poems*, and a second time in a composition of similar form in the *Flowers of Sion*. This device consists of constructing the sonnet on two rime-words only, alternating according to rules. There can be little doubt that the Scottish poet borrowed this idea from Sonnet CX in Du Bellay's *Olive*; in both poets the two rime-words chosen are the same, and the general theme of Du Bellay's sonnet and of the one 'Upon the Sepulchre of our Lord' in the *Flowers of Sion* is very similar:

Life, to give life, deprived is of life,
And death display'd hath ensign against death;
So violent the rigour was of death,
That nought could daunt it but the life of life:
No power had power to thrall life's power to death,
But willingly life hath abandoned life,
Love gave the wound which wrought this work of death,
His bow and shafts were of the tree of life.

Dieu, qui changeant avec obscure mort
Ta bien-heureuse et immortelle vie

Fus aux pécheurs prodigue de ta vie,
Pour les tirer de l'éternelle mort:

Telle pitié coulpable de ta mort

Guide les pas de ma fascheuse vie
Tant que par toy, à plus joyeuse vie
Je soy' conduit du travail de la mort.

Now quakes the author of eternal death,
To find that they whom erst he reft of life,
Shall fill his room above the lists of death;
Now all rejoice in death who hope for life.
Dead Jesus lies, who death hath killed by death,
His tomb no tomb is, but new source of life.

N'avise point, ô Seigneur, que ma vie
Ne soit noyée aux ondes de la mort,
Qui me distrait d'une si douce vie:
Oste la palme à ceste injuste mort
Qui jà s'en va superbe de ma vie,
Et morte soy toujours pour moy la mort.

Very probably Drummond found an additional inducement to attempt this metrical *tour de force* from the fact that Sir Philip Sidney, whom he never ceased to look upon as a model, had successfully coped with the difficulties it presents in the eighty-ninth sonnet of *Astrophel and Stella*, and also in the sonnet of the Third Book of *Arcadia*, with which Zelmane, sitting in the first entry of the wonderful cave, 'gave a doleful way to her bitter effects[1].'

L. E. KASTNER.

ABERYSTWYTH.

[1] The two rime-words used by Sir Philip Sidney are 'night' and 'day,' and 'dark' and 'light' respectively. This device, though very rare, was not unknown to the Italians. In view of the above considerations, it is highly improbable that Drummond's source is Italian rather than French, or that he constructed the sonnet in question on the pattern of the anonymous Italian sonnet utilized by Du Bellay and found by the latter in a collection which in Drummond's days was no longer read. (Cf. J. Vianey, *Les sources italiennes de l'Olive*, Paris, 1901.) Originally the idea seems to have been suggested by the fourteenth sonnet of Petrarch's *Rime*, in which the octave is constructed on the two rime-words 'parte' and 'luce.'

SHAKSPERE'S PLAYS: AN EXAMINATION.

IV[1].

To Shakspere's portion of *The Taming of the Shrew* various dates from 1594 to 1607 have been assigned. That the play is only partly his is admitted on all hands. The whole of Act I; II, 1, from 'But who comes here? *Enter Gremio*' to 'That is, her love; for that is all in all'; III, 1; the last nine speeches of III, 2; IV, 2; IV, 4; the last three lines of IV, 5; V, 1; and the first speech and five closing speeches of V, 2 are clearly by another author, to whom also must be attributed the closing portion of II, 1 (perhaps from the re-entry of Baptista, perhaps only from Petruchio's exit) and that portion of III, 2 extending from Petruchio's first entry to his re-entry (or, it may be, only from his first exit to Gremio's subsequent entry), while that part of V, 2 preceding Bianca's exit may also perhaps be wholly or partly by him. Whoever this writer was, he may be judged by his metre to belong to the early days of the drama, for his style is stiff and antiquated. Shakspere's work in the play proper—that is to say, all that is not to be ascribed to the second writer—is also so obviously of early date that it is difficult to understand how any critics can have been bold enough to declare it to be in his best style, or even to attribute it to so late a date as 1597. His work of much earlier date than that is more finished than is his portion of *The Shrew*. Part of IV, 3 and perhaps also the longest speech in his part of V, 2 may alone be deemed to belong to his second period. The play tells two separate stories—that of the shrew (contained in the first 28 speeches of I, 2; II, 1, to Petruchio's exit; III, 2; IV, 1, 3, 5; V, 1, from Gremio's exit; and V, 2), and that of Bianca's lovers. With the latter Shakspere did not meddle: for the former he was mainly responsible. It has been said that the merit of the play is entirely confined to the Petruchio scenes. This is true; but the merit is by no

[1] Continued from *Modern Language Review*, Vol. IV (January, 1909), p. 199.

means so great as the critics would have us believe. That Shakspere could possibly have created in his third or fourth period so tame a shrew as Katherine is incredible. Her shrewishness is shown only by an occasional cuffing, but her conquest is really very easy and not at all convincing; and the conception and presentment of the character would (if it be not damnable heresy to say so) do little credit to the great dramatist even in his second period. Besides this and the run of the verse, there are other reasons for the belief that the play is of early date. The denying of Vincentio resembles the denying of Ægeon in *The Comedy of Errors*, and portions of II, 1 and V, 2 are comparable with the silly chaff that plays so large a part in *Love's Labour's Lost*. Whether Shakspere's work was grafted on to the other man's or his was the earlier is not an easy question to settle. The mention of 'Cousin Ferdinand' in IV, 1, and the introduction of Hortensio in IV, 3 apparently in his stead may be held to be against co-operation, and, as they occur in Shakspere's portion, to favour the view that he was the reviser rather than the original author. The question is complicated by the fact that an old play *The Taming of a Shrew*, published in 1594, was used by Shakspere in writing up the Petruchio story (unless indeed both plays stole from some lost original). In the old play the Bianca story does not occur, and the author of that portion of the later play is verbally indebted to *A Shrew* only for the couplet in Petruchio's last speech beginning 'Come Kate, we'll to bed' (unless, as is probable, that couplet be Shakspere's conclusion to the play, the other author having preceded it by a couple of doggrel lines and followed it by four others). With this possible exception, the use of the old play is confined to Shakspere's part of V, 2, to his IV, 1 and IV, 3, and to the Induction.

Of this induction, together with the short interlude between the two scenes of Act I, nothing has yet been said. This framework of the play of *The Shrew* is certainly not by the author of the Lucentio-Bianca story; but whether it is or is not by Shakspere is a matter not easy to decide. There is nothing in it that might not (judging by style) be early Shakspere, and yet it is hard to find a passage that can be pronounced incontrovertibly his. It might, by reason of his presence in the main body of the play and its resemblance to his work, be ascribed to Shakspere, were it not for the circumstance that in the folio it is shown that one of the actors was Sinklo, who belonged to the Chamberlain's Company at a date when Shakspere could hardly have written in this style, and for the further circumstance that the Induction contains a very plain allusion to Fletcher's *Women Pleased*,

which cannot well be dated earlier than Shakspere's fourth period. Perhaps the most natural explanation is that Shakspere's version originally ran:

Lord. Do you intend to stay with me to-night?
2nd Play. So please your lordship to accept our duty.
Lord. Well, you are come to me in happy time;

and that the seven lines containing the allusion referred to were a late insertion by some one other than Shakspere.

Henry V contains one fragment of doubtful authorship—the last twenty-two speeches of III, 2, containing the chatter of the Scotch, Welsh, and Irish captains. The drama would lose nothing by its omission, as it serves no purpose and is possibly a late insertion, perhaps Shakspere's, but more probably not. It is not found in the quarto version, and in the folio contains oaths which have been omitted in most other parts of the play, while it is worthy of note that Fluellen, previously styled 'Flu.' in the sideheads, is here called 'Welch.' The rest of the play is undoubtedly Shakspere's, but either the work is very hurried or it has been greatly curtailed. The former explanation is probably the correct one, for there are one or two inconsistencies that can be accounted for otherwise only if the shortening was accompanied by needless alteration.

Of the two *Henry IV* plays, the only portions that are to be considered as of doubtful authorship occur in the first part. They are II, 1 as far as 'Exeunt Carriers' and the final couplet in IV, 2. Though it is possible that the earlier may be a player's insertion and that the latter may be a remnant of the work of an early writer, they may both, though not without hesitation, be ascribed to Shakspere, some of whose work in the first play may be of early date. This play is certainly an alteration and was published as 'corrected' by Shakspere. There exist reasons not individually strong but cumulatively of some weight to believe that it was in existence in some form in 1592. The second part is not always consistent with the first, and it is obvious that either much of it is hasty work or it has been subject to alteration. Both causes may operate, the latter one certainly does.

In the first part it is extraordinary that Shakspere should have thrown away the fine opportunity that was afforded him in the charging of Falstaff with the robbery and the striking of the chief Justice by the Prince. Did he shirk it? And again it might have been expected that the audience would have been enlightened before V, 3 as to the intention of the king to have many 'marching in his coats.' It may

also be remarked that the name Gadshill which must have struck many readers as a strange name for the author to have given to one of the heroes of the robbery at Gad's Hill is due to Shakspere's misunderstanding of the use of the name in the anonymous *Famous Victories*, where the robber, whose real name is Cutter, is addressed ironically by his victim as Gadshill, to show that he is recognised. Both the *Henry IV* plays seem, like *Merry Wives*, to have some mysterious connection with Michael Drayton, but the writing shows no sign of his presence.

As to the date of the second part, it is to be noted that Meres (in 1598) speaks of *Henry IV*, as if it were but a single play. This may, but does not certainly, mean that the second part was not then in existence. Confirmation is afforded by the entry of the first part in the *Stationers' Register* in February 1597–8 as *The History of Henry the Fourth* without any hint of its being only one of two parts. That later editions continued the title of the first quarto does not seriously affect the argument, and it is singular that it is not till June 1623 that the earlier play is first spoken of as the first part. The second part should therefore date some time between 1597–8 and its publication in 1600. It may be set against this view that Meres classes *Henry IV* among the tragedies; but the first part is better entitled to be so classed than is the second part, though the tragedy is not Henry's, but Percy's.

That Shakspere's work in *The Merchant of Venice* is of more than one date should be clear to all. The early portion of I, 1 and II, 1 are imitative of Marlowe and the coarseness of Portia in I, 2 may be ascribed to the youthful mind. The story was dramatised as early as 1579, and there are some reasons to believe that the old play was used by Shakspere. To the old writer may be attributed the doggrel that closes I, 2:

> Sirrah, go before.
> Whiles we shut the gate upon one wooer, another knocks at the door.

In III, 5 a Moor is mentioned as being in child by Launcelot Gobbo. This probably refers to some incident dropped out by Shakspere when he re-wrote the play. The two speeches in which the matter is referred to may possibly belong to the original writer, but would seem rather to be Shaksperian, probably reduced from doggrel to prose. With the exception of the doggrel couplet in I, 1, which is in all probability Shakspere's own, there is no other fragment of the present play that can be a relic of the old drama of 1579. In I, 2 there has apparently been some revision, for, though six suitors are named, they are after-

wards spoken of as only four in number. An examination of this scene serves to show that the speech naming Faulconbridge and the three speeches immediately following were a late insertion after the first production of the play. They may or may not be Shakspere's, for they contain nothing either markedly typical of him or distinctly opposed to his authorship. There being no other sign of the presence of a later reviser, they may be attributed to Shakspere, like the rest of the play, except the one bit of doggrel already quoted. It may be remarked that this Faulconbridge insertion has supplied critics with a reason for dating the drama 1596. The name is very reasonably supposed to have been taken from *John*, but such an argument may quite as well be advanced against Shakspere's authorship of the passage wherein it occurs as in favour of a date of 1596. Some of the play besides this particular passage would seem by style to belong to such a date or even two or three years later, but a great deal of it is much earlier. This means that Shakspere wrote the play on the basis of the old comedy of 1579 and afterwards revised his work. To the first version may belong the allusion in IV, 1, to Marlowe's *Jew of Malta* ('of the stock of Barabbas'). Though such an idea will certainly be scouted, it is more than probable that in the opening portion of Act 5 Shakspere deliberately refers to Marlowe and Nashe's *Dido*, his own *Troilus* (the first production of which has been shown to be of early date), his *Midsummer Night's Dream* (or more probably, some *Pyramus and Thisbe* play at which Shakspere laughed in the *Dream*), and a lost play on the subject of *Medea*. This first version must have been produced not later than 1594.

John is clearly Shakspere's (though founded on the old non-Shaksperian *Troublesome Reign*) but also clearly of two periods, I, 1, I, 2, and II, 1, e.g., being obviously much earlier than V, 1. The play would seem to have been shortened for representation; and the same may be said of *Richard II*, which also is entirely Shakspere's, though one speech from it is in England's *Parnassus* (1600) attributed to Drayton.

Concerning *Romeo* it is not easy to come to any definite opinion. That the play is at least mainly Shakspere's is certain, and it is almost equally certain that it is of two dates, the prologue; I, 2, 5, chorus; II, 1, 3; IV, 1 (as far as Paris' exit), 2, 3, 5 (from Lady Capulet's entry); and V, 2 being much earlier in style than the rest of the play; but it is questionable if some of these are Shakspere's, the ones that raise a doubt being the prologue, II, 3, IV, 2, IV, 3, and the above-mentioned portion of IV, 5. The first four may be given to Shakspere because they contain nothing that may not be his, but that part of IV, 5 lying

between Lady Capulet's entry and the end of Capulet's second last speech, though it may possibly be Shakspere's, looks rather like burlesque and is reminiscent of the foolery in the play within the play of *Midsummer Night's Dream*. It must be branded 'very doubtful.' The statement on the title-page of the first quarto that this play was acted by Lord Hunsdon's men is generally taken to show that the date of production was between August 1596 and April 1597, during which time alone was Shakspere's company known as Lord Hunsdon's. In reality the statement implies nothing of the sort. All that is to be educed from it is that the quarto was published during the eight months that the company was not known as the Lord Chamberlain's. Thus the 1599 edition described it as acted by the Lord Chamberlain's, because the company was then so called.

Richard III is best considered with the *Henry VI* trilogy, to which it forms a sequel; and *Titus* is for many reasons best taken with them. The remaining plays are *Midsummer Night's Dream, Two Gentlemen, Comedy of Errors,* and *Love's Labour's Lost.* Of these the first-named is entirely Shakspere's, but there are many signs of the play having undergone revision and abbreviation. If in its present form it be of as early a date as some of the critics have supposed, Shakspere's style must have been formed early. Rather may it be believed with others of the *cognoscenti* that its revision is attributable to the latter part of Shakspere's second period or to the early part of his third.

Two Gentlemen, Comedy of Errors, and *Love's Labour's Lost* are bound together by the occurrence of doggrel in all of them, though in the first-named there is no great quantity—less indeed than in *The Shrew,* which is, with the exception of *The Merchant of Venice* (which has a mere trifle), the only other one of the thirty-six folio plays so distinguished. The critics have accordingly proclaimed doggrel to be a characteristic of Shakspere's first period, and then, using the base with which they have thus provided themselves, have declared the play which contains the greatest amount of doggrel (*Love's Labour's Lost*) to be the earliest in date, the only other one which is very largely tainted (*Comedy of Errors*) to be its immediate successor, and the *Two Gentlemen* to come third on the list, it being recognised that the doggrel in *The Shrew* is wholly or mainly the work of another. This is circular argument; these plays are the earliest because they contain so much of the doggrel characteristic of Shakspere in his first period, and the doggrel is characteristic of Shakspere in his first period because it is found in these, his earliest plays. It stands to reason that if the

great poet used this species of verse at all it must have been in the early part of his career, before he knew better, and in that case the inference is strong that these three plays are his earliest; but his authorship of the passages on which this conclusion is based must first be determined. In this connection one has to consider that portion of the opening scene of *The Two Gentlemen* during which Speed is on the stage, the four anapæstic four-foot lines succeeding Silvia's entry in II, 1, and the doggrel and seven-foot verse (totalling eleven lines) in the latter part of the same scene; the whole of III, 1 of *The Comedy of Errors* save the first speech and the last five speeches, the doggrel in IV, 2, a couple of lines in II, 1, two in II, 2, the same number also in III, 2, and the final couplet in V, 1; and in *Love's Labour's Lost*, II, 1 from the King's exit, III, 1 to Moth's second exit, IV, 1 from Costard's entry (omitting the letter and the half-dozen lines following), IV, 2 prior to Jaquenetta's second speech, IV, 3 prior to Dumain's ode and from Jaquenetta's entry to exit, and V, 2 to Boyet's entry and from Costard's first entry to Mercade's entry. Outside of these scenes and portions of scenes, there is nothing in any of the three plays that is to be classed as non-Shaksperian, with the exception perhaps of three lines in I, 1 of *Errors*:

> Thus have you heard me severed from my bliss,
> That by misfortunes was my life prolonged,
> To tell sad stories of my own mishaps.

These lines may be accepted (with a grimace) as Shakspere's if the presence of another be discernible nowhere else in the play, and may be his in any case; but before the authorship of the other passages indicated above be considered, a few words may be said in regard to each of the three plays in question.

The undoubtedly Shaksperian part of *Two Gentlemen* is obviously of more than one date, and that it has undergone alteration is, moreover, rendered probable by the confusion that exists in one or two particulars, and also by the very uneven lengths of the various acts. Of the assuredly Shaksperian scenes, II, 4 may be mentioned as a sample of early work, and IV, 4 as a sample of revision, while part of IV, 1 may be of still later date. Meres, in 1598, speaks of *The Gentlemen of Verona*, and this may perhaps have been the title of Shakspere's first version. *Love's Labour's Lost* likewise shows many signs of alteration, amongst which may be mentioned the confusion between Holofernes and Nathaniel. Some of the play was obviously written not long before its publication in 1598, and the statement on the title-page of the

quarto, that it had been 'newly corrected and augmented' is clearly trustworthy. The natural interpretation is that there was an earlier edition, unfortunately now lost. Even the unquestionably Shaksperian portions are of partly first and partly second period. *The Comedy of Errors* differs from both these plays in that the style of the undeniably genuine portion may well be all of the one period. The date is a matter of doubt, the only allusions giving a clue occurring in III, 2, and even these are not decisive, for, to anyone who regards them strictly on their merits, all they prove is a date not earlier than April 1585 and not later than February 1593–4. If the probabilities be considered fairly, the reference to France's 'heir' may be held to imply a date prior to rather than subsequent to August 1589, while the allusion to Spain's hot breath may, as Richard Simpson urged, infer a pre-Armada date. In this connection it is well to remember the Tarleton allusion in *Twelfth Night* (necessarily not later than 1588) and the points of contact between that play and *The Comedy of Errors*.

There are three possible solutions of the authorship of the doggrel passages in the three plays that are now claiming our attention—the first (that adopted by all the critics without exception) is, that Shakspere wrote them as he wrote the rest of the three plays; the second is, that he had a colleague who was responsible for these portions of the plays, an idea which may be summarily dismissed, inasmuch as the doggrel appears in some scenes intertwined with work that is unquestionably Shaksperian; the third is, that Shakspere's work was in every case based on an early play by some other writer. This last is the view that, though, so far as I know, never yet put forward, has most to commend it.

Let us consider all that is meant by an acceptance of the common belief that the miserable doggrel in these three plays must be laid at the door of Shakspere. He is universally held to have been the greatest writer, the greatest dramatist, the greatest poet whom the world has ever seen; yet, if this theory be correct, he was, when (if the dates ordinarily accepted for the first versions of the three plays be taken) from twenty-five to thirty years of age, writing doggrel that a schoolboy of that day would have been ashamed to father. If one assume dates of from 1587 to 1589 for the first versions of his plays the case is not much better, for he was twenty-three years of age in the former year, twenty-five in the latter—quite old enough to know better. Kyd, Marlowe, Greene, Peele, had all written blank verse, and shown what it was capable of; and yet, we are asked to believe, Shakspere was so lacking

in taste, so incapable of appreciation of this new instrument being forged for the use of English poets that he preferred to dabble in doggrel such as had been rejected with scorn by poets only slightly older. Who can credit that, with the exception of Robert Wilson, the only dramatist of the day to write doggrel was William Shakspere? That is what the acceptance of the common view calls upon us to believe. The idea is preposterous. In reality the mere presence of anything more than the merest sprinkling of doggrel in a play should be enough to suggest for it a date prior to 1588. It may be doubted if even the non-Shaksperian portions of *The Shrew* form an exception.

The chances are then in favour of a very early date for the doggrel portions of these three plays, and there are not lacking facts in support of this view. In 1584–5 there was a *Felix and Philismena* acted at Court by the Queen's men. This play must have been founded on Montemayor's story, which forms one of the two bases of Shakspere's *Two Gentlemen*. In 1581–2 the Chamberlain's Company presented at Court a *History of Ferrar* which may or may not have been identical with the *History of Error* given by Paul's five years earlier. Concerning an original of *Love's Labour's Lost* we have no information, but it is noteworthy that part of the play deals with an event of May 1583, when the Russian Embassy visited England. The probability of the originals of all these plays dating between 1581 and 1585 is thus considerable; and one is justified in assuming that the antiquated verse of much of the three plays must belong to them, and confirmation of the assumption is perhaps afforded by Speed's statement (in II, 1 of *Two Gentlemen*) concerning some 7-foot verse he has just spoken—'All this I speak in print, for in print I found it.'

If this view be right, the doggrel patches in II, 1, II, 2, III, 2, IV, 2, and V, 1 of *Comedy of Errors* may perhaps be remnants of the original play by another author than Shakspere and the bulk of III, 1 must be attributable to this early writer. One might reasonably assert (as has often been asserted) that Shakspere made the Dromios speak in doggrel because it suited their characters, but in III, 1, Antipholus of Ephesus, Angelo and Balthazar all speak the dialect of Dromio. In *The Two Gentlemen*, the remaining work of the original author, whoever he may have been, consists only of fifteen lines in II, 1, and fragments of the Speed portion of the opening scene. Of *Love's Labour's Lost*, the parts already indicated as doubtful are the remains of a pre-Shaksperian writer, though III, 1, as far as Moth's second exit, the first part of IV, 2 (that is to say, prior to Jaquenetta's second speech), IV, 3 prior to

Dumain's ode, and v, 2, to Boyet's entry and from Costard's first exit to Mercade's entry, contain work of Shakspere's.

All the thirty-six plays of the folio have now been dealt with with the exception of five in which the work of the great dramatist was of a purely imitative character, making it exceedingly difficult to discriminate between his work and that of the men he honoured with imitation. The basis of style taken here is scarcely sufficient for the purpose. Moreover a fitting investigation of these five plays would require almost as much space as I have devoted to the other thirty-one; for every one of them shows the presence of another writer than Shakspere, and all of them offer resemblances to certain anonymous plays of the period—*Arden, Edward III, Soliman and Perseda*, and others—all of which would call for careful study and comparison with the five plays in question.

It will not have been overlooked that, by limiting my field of operations to the plays contained in the first folio, I have excluded *Pericles*, which is unanimously regarded as canonical. But, so far as the external evidence is concerned, it has no stronger a claim than two or three other plays excluded from the first folio; and therefore it would be invidious to pick out it alone for study. On the other hand, to enter upon the examination of all the plays connected with Shakspere's name but omitted from the first folio is a task calling for more time than I have at my disposal. Therefore, feeling the only fair alternative to be to deal with all or with none of these plays, I decided on the latter course, though it has necessitated the omission of *Pericles*.

E. H. C. Oliphant.

London.

THE SOURCE OF SOUTHERNE'S 'FATAL MARRIAGE.'

Thomas Southerne's tragi-comedy *The Fatal Marriage, or The Innocent Adultery* (1694) may be said to consist of two independent plays. It contains a tragedy the subject of which is fairly accurately described by its two titles, and which owes nothing, it may be added, to Scarron's novel, *L'Adultère innocente*. This tragedy was separated out by Garrick and printed in 1757 under the title *Isabella, or the Fatal Marriage*. The second element is an unsavoury comic underplot, which, as the author has himself admitted, is cumbersome for the progress of the main action: 'I have given you a little taste of comedy...not from my own opinion, but the present humour of the town: I never contend that, because every reasonable man will, and ought to govern in the pleasures he pays for. I had no occasion for the comedy, but in the three first acts,' etc.[1] Garrick had thus the best excuse for remodelling the play, and he has done so with complete success.

Not only are the tragedy and comedy in Southerne's drama easily separable, but they are distinct in origin. In Southerne's *Dedication* just quoted he says: 'I took the hint of the tragical part from a novel of Mrs Behn's, called the *Fair Vow-breaker*: you will forgive me for calling it a hint, when you find I have little more than borrowed the question, how far such a distress was to be carried, upon the misfortune of a woman's having innocently two husbands at the same time?' By most biographers and critics this curiously involved and qualified statement has been assumed to mean that Southerne was indebted to Mrs Aphra Behn for the main plot of his tragi-comedy. This interpretation was first put forward in the *Life of Southerne* prefixed to Volume I of the three volume edition of the *Plays* printed for Thomas Evans and T. Becket (1774). Although Thomas Evans

[1] Southerne, in his *Dedication* to *The Fatal Marriage* (*Plays*, 1774, Vol. II, p. 182).

(1742–84), who was both bookseller and critic, is not mentioned as the author of the *Life* either in the *Dictionary of National Biography* or in the Catalogue of the British Museum, yet no doubt seems possible that it was written by him, it being signed with his initials 'T. E.' Now it was in this biography that the 'hint' of Southerne's own statement was transformed into a confession of borrowing[1]. Evans' statement reappears in Ward's *History of Dramatic Literature*[2], in the same writer's notice of Southerne in the *Dictionary of National Biography* and in Joseph Knight's *David Garrick* (1894)[3].

It is, however, a little surprising to find that not one of Mrs Behn's tales corresponds with Southerne's description in his *Dedication*, or with the subject of his tragedy. The bibliography of that authoress is so confused and the collection of her works in the British Museum so incomplete, that it is unsafe to make too sweeping statements. Among her collected novels[4], there is one entitled *The Nun, or the Perjur'd Beauty*, and Mr Gosse has kindly informed me that that story is identical with *The Nun, or the Fair Vow-breaker* which appears in the *editio princeps* of 1689 (inaccessible to me). This being so, it is clear that Southerne's biographers have been in error as to the real source of *The Fatal Marriage*. For the perjured nun of Mrs Behn's novel, instead of having, as Southerne implies, two husbands at the same time, remains unmarried to the last, notwithstanding her fickle passions for three different men, and, so far from being the innocent woman described by Southerne, she is responsible for five deaths: her three lovers, the mother superior of the convent and herself. Isabella, on the other hand, is as virtuous as Mrs Behn's nun is the opposite, and she falls a victim to her brother-in-law's wiles; Southerne's play is sentimental, while Mrs Behn's story is a picture of heartless treachery, beginning with perjury and ending in bloodshed. The contrast could not well be greater.

Thus Southerne took for his play, as he himself said, no more than a hint—one is inclined to say hardly a hint—from Mrs Behn's *The Fair Vow-breaker*. An examination of Mrs Behn's other novels has not revealed any material points of analogy between these and *The Fatal Marriage*.

[1] '...the plot, by the author's own confession, is taken from a novel of Mrs Behn's called *The Nun, or Fair Vow-breaker*.' (*Life of Southerne*, in *Plays*, 1774, Vol. I, p. 6.)

[2] Ed. 1899, Vol. III, p. 421.

[3] Ward, *l.c.*, surmises that Southerne's *Innocent Adultery* is the book mentioned in Sheridan's *Rivals* (I, ii). But was Miss Lydia Languish not more likely to have read Scarron's novel, several English versions of which had long been in existence?

[4] *All the Histories and Novels*, 1705.

Much more closely allied to the theme of the play is a novel by Roger Lestrange, *The Virgin Captive*, the fifth story in *The Spanish Decameron*, made English by Roger Lestrange, London, 1687. In that novel, the foreign source of which I have not been able to trace, two lovers, Philocles and Aurelia, promise to wait two years for each other. A report is spread that Philocles has been killed in the wars, and when the two years are over, Aurelia resolves to become a nun. On the way to the convent, she meets a stranger in a slave's habit, who proves to be no other than her lover just freed from captivity. He claims her and marries her. This story is, however, of so common a type that its analogy with Southerne's plot is no proof that he made use of Lestrange's work. The same type of story appears for instance, twice in the *Decamerone*, once with a tragic ending (IV, 8), and again with a happy one (X, 9)[1]; it then passed with Boccaccio to Spain, and from Spain found its way into English drama and fiction.

The real source of *The Fatal Marriage*, as of so many other seventeenth century plays, is Spanish. It is the story of the lovers of Teruel, which was not probably known to Southerne through an English version of the legend—the existence of which is problematical—but through the most popular Spanish version, namely, Juan Perez de Montalvan's *Amantes de Teruel* (1638). This comedia had been preceded by two others on the same theme, A. Rey de Artieda's (1581) and Tirso de Molina's (1635), it being itself based on the latter. The source of the Spanish legend is, according to the best authorities[2], Boccaccio's tale of *Girolamo and Salvestra* (*Decamerone*, IV, 8).

The main point in which Southerne's drama differs from the Spanish originals is the circumstance mentioned in his *Dedication* as a hint borrowed from Mrs Behn. The Spanish heroine, Isabella de Segura, is not married to two men at the same time. She is pledged to wait for her first lover during a definite period: three years and three days in Tirso and Montalvan, seven years in Hieronimo de Guerta's *Florando de Castilla* (1616)[3], and after waiting faithfully and being disappointed, she reluctantly yields to a second suitor who is favoured by her father. Thus there is only one marriage, and the Spanish Isabella is free from the charge of adultery, either guilty or innocent. On the night of the wedding the first lover, who has been falsely reported to have fallen in

[1] It is treated farcically in Shirley's *Hyde Park*.

[2] E. Cotarelo y Mori, *Sobre el origen y desarrollo de la leyenda de los Amantes de Teruel*, Madrid, 1907; Miss C. B. Bourland, *Boccaccio and the Decameron in Castilian and Catalan Literature* in the *Revue Hispanique*, XII; M. Menéndez y Pelayo, *Orígenes de la novela*, II (1907), p. xvi.

[3] Canto IX.

the wars, reappears. From this point onwards, the story differs considerably in the two Spanish plays; Tirso adheres closely to tradition and to Boccaccio, while Montalvan introduces several changes, some of which have been adopted by his English imitator. In Tirso the first lover méets the bride in the bridal chamber, claims a kiss and when denied, falls down at her feet and dies of grief. The bridegroom then takes the dead man on his back and carries him to the threshold of his father's house. At the funeral the bride dies upon her lover's body. In Montalvan's version of the legend the marriage is consummated and the bedroom and funeral scenes omitted; Montalvan's lover 'se dió la muerte sin espada,' i.e., dies of a broken heart behind a curtain, and when the curtain is drawn aside, the lady takes his hand, kisses him and dies also.

The English Restoration dramatist carries what might be called the prosaic interpretation of the legend a step further. He preserves Isabella's Christian name and nationality, but he transfers her from Teruel to Brussels, and makes her a runaway nun[1]. His heroine is not a despairing maiden, but a mourning and courted widow, and the melodramatic element is heightened by scenes of madness, the introduction of hired assassins, by the machinations of a stage villain and by suicide. While Tirso and Montalvan disregard the unity of time, Southerne's play does not cover much more than the twenty-four hours allowed by the critical doctrine of his day. The English playwright is mainly concerned with the subject of the third 'jornada' of the Spanish comedias, namely, his heroine's second marriage, and her earlier elopement from a convent is only lightly touched upon. Isabella appears here as a distressed widow and mother. Her broken vows are urged against her, she is driven to despair by her relentless father-in-law and by his fiendish son, and her innocent child is threatened with starvation, all before she consents to marry her second suitor. Thus domestic interests are brought into the foreground; the English playwright divides his heroine's feelings between two husbands and a child, and her fidelity to her first love, which was the main feature of the original legend, is obscured.

Southerne again differs from Tirso and Montalvan in the choice of the agency by which the 'fatal marriage'—with him the second—is brought about. In Boccaccio's tale there is no pledge or engagement. In De Guerta's narrative Isabella marries the second suitor after the

[1] Since the appearance of Marianna d'Alcoforado's love-letters, translated by Roger Lestrange in 1678, the loves of nuns were a favourite theme in literature.

lapse of the seven years agreed upon, but in each of the three plays an intrigue is introduced. In Tirso de Molina, the second suitor, Gonçalo, is a villain and has a messenger bring false news of the first lover's death; in Montalvan a cousin of Isabella, Elena, who is herself in love with the absent warrior, plots with the second suitor to intercept the letters to Isabella, and to have the false news brought to her. Southerne, while retaining the story of the intercepted letters and the lying messenger, introduces a new villain to carry out the intrigue. In the English play an obdurate father-in-law is substituted for Isabella's own father[1], and the war takes place in the island of Candy instead of Tunis; there are also many changes in the minor characters.

Here the analogies between *The Fatal Marriage* and its Spanish prototypes come to an end, and English influences, especially of Shakspeare and Fletcher, make themselves felt. The villain Carlos, for instance, who brings about the catastrophe reminds us of Edmund in *Lear*, and a Shakspearian touch may also be detected in the despair and madness of Isabella after her first husband reappears.

For the comic underplot, or, as it is called in the *Dedication* of *The Fatal Marriage*, the 'comedy,' an English source has been pointed out, namely, Fletcher's *Nightwalker, or the Little Thief*. This play, indeed, reads like a burlesque of Boccaccio's *Girolamo and Salvestra* and its Spanish imitations; like *The Fatal Marriage*, it contains two death and burial incidents, and in both plays a miser is buried alive by his own son, and persuaded that he belongs to the nether world until he promises to renounce his avarice.

The connection between Southerne's play and Montalvan's is unmistakable, but the question is naturally still open whether Southerne was not drawing from some more immediate English source—possibly even from some lost version of the story by Mrs Behn herself. Have there been English stories on the same theme, directly or indirectly descended from *Decamerone*, IV, 8, other than Roger Lestrange's *Virgin Captive* and Turberville's doggrel 'tragical tale' of *Girolam and Salvestra*? The latter, it may be added, is of no account in the present connection. In his *Dedication* Southerne may have merely intended to pay a compliment to his literary friend Mrs Behn; but he is certainly not likely to have troubled himself either to conceal or discover his indebtedness to Montalvan or any other Spanish source.

PAUL HAMELIUS.

LIÈGE.

[1] In Boccaccio this rôle is attributed to the lover's mother, assisted by his guardians, or 'tutors,' as Turberville calls them.

THE TEXT OF 'PIERS PLOWMAN.'

I. The A-Text.

The question of the authorship of the different versions of *Piers Plowman* has recently been discussed at some length by many critics[1], and is likely to give rise to much further discussion before opinion settles down definitely in favour of either 'one author or five.' It is not our purpose here to enter into that controversy, but to draw attention to certain textual problems which seem hitherto to have been overlooked, but which nevertheless affect, to a very considerable degree, the arguments which have been put forward upon either side.

Professor Manly has called attention to the fact that many of the minor alterations, generally supposed to have been made when the work was recast into what Professor Skeat has named the B-text, are really to be found in certain MSS. of the A-text: 'In his reworking of the poems he [the author of the B-text] practically disregarded passus XII and changed the preceding eleven passus by insertions and expansions. Minor verbal alterations he also made, but far fewer than is usually supposed. Many of those credited to him are to be found among the variant readings of the A-text, and were merely taken over unchanged from the MS. of A used as the basis[2].' This would seem to clench finally the argument in favour of multiple authorship. For these variants are exceedingly numerous: they often involve serious differences of sense and of metre. It is hardly conceivable that the reviser, had he been the original author, would have used as the basis of his B-text a vicious transcript which had travelled, by successive corruptions, so far from his original work.

[1] J. M. Manly in *Modern Philology*, January, 1906; H. Bradley in *The Athenæum*, April 21, 1906; J. M. Manly in *The Cambridge History of English Literature*, vol. II, 1908; Th. Hall in *The Modern Language Review*, October, 1908; J. J. Jusserand in *Modern Philology*, January, 1909.

[2] *Cambridge History of English Literature*, II, p. 23.

But an interpretation of the phenomena of the text, quite different from that assumed by Professor Manly, is possible. Do these so-called 'variants' preserve the real reading of the original A-text, as it left the author's hands, whilst the alternative readings, which have been adopted in the received A-text, represent the variants of an individual MS. or class of MSS.?

It has not been recognized that the received A-text is not an attempt to reconstruct the original text, as written by the poet. It is a reprint with some corrections of a single MS.—the Vernon (V)—which Prof. Skeat selected, believing that its readings were, 'on the whole, better than those of any other.' Having selected this MS., the editor's object was to print it *with as few corrections as might be.* With this object, readings admittedly inferior were retained in the text, and have been reproduced alike in the Early English Text and in the Oxford editions[1]. Nevertheless, in some two hundred cases[2], that is approximately once in every dozen lines, the reading of the Vernon MS. had to be corrected from the other MSS.: in the first place from MS. Harleian 875 (H), which of all the A-MSS. agrees most closely with V: from other MSS. where, as not infrequently, V and H agree in an impossible reading.

It is, then, a grave misapprehension for critics to speak and argue as if the received text of A reproduced, or had been intended to reproduce, the author's exact words, and could thus be taken as a criterion of his vocabulary and metrical usage. If, in two hundred places, the Vernon MS. is so erroneous that an editor, determined to make no alteration unless it be absolutely necessary, is yet compelled to fall back upon the other MSS., then it may well contain a thousand or more uncorrected alterations and corruptions. For, to every one instance in which we can detect a scribal alteration by reason of its intrinsic absurdity, there may well be half a dozen in which the variant is not so seriously inferior as to be quite untenable. Hence it is, and has long been, a recognized principle in the textual criticism of the Greek and Latin classics, that a text, which adheres to one MS. in every case except where the reading of that one MS. is untenable, cannot arrive at a reconstruction of the original. In so many of the most interesting old and middle English texts, preserved as they have been in unique MSS., we are, then, entirely at the mercy of the scribe, and can only resign ourselves to the certainty

[1] Cf. the critical notes in the E.E.T.S. edition of the A-text, to Pro., 14, 75; I, 39, 79, 87, 135; II, 9, 118, 129, 206; III, 32, 174, 266—9; and especially V, 125 where Skeat states 'My object is to avoid alteration as much as possible.'

[2] Excluding cases where a whole line or passage is inserted from other MSS.

that, whilst that scribe has made many alterations which we can detect, he has as certainly made many others which we cannot, and that therefore we must give up all hope of getting the author's exact words in every case. But where, on the other hand, we have a peculiarly rich supply of MSS., as we have in the case of *Piers Plowman*, we may well hope to correct even the minor errors of the one by comparison with the others.

There are fourteen MSS. of the A-text of *Piers Plowman*. A complete collation of these has never been issued. Professor Skeat appended to his reprint of the Vernon text complete collations of three MSS., and partial collations of two others. There remain eight MSS. scattered throughout the kingdom, collations of which have not been published; in some cases because Professor Skeat thought them of only secondary importance, but in others[1] because, at the time the Vernon text was being printed, they were unknown. And indeed, so long as the A-text was regarded as merely the first rough draft of a poem, afterwards reissued authoritatively by its author in complete form as the B-text, it might well seem an effort of needless curiosity to strive to fix, to an *Ac* or a *But* the precise wording of such a superseded draft. But now that it is being argued from the 'diction, metre and sentence structure' of this A-text, that its author cannot have been the reviser of the B-text, it becomes important to fix, with the utmost possible precision, the exact text of the original A-version. We therefore submit the following notes, which are founded upon our own transcripts and collations of every known MS. of the A-text[2], whether good or bad.

The impression created when the A- and B-texts are read side by side is generally that the A-text is inferior in both metre and style. Many passages, vigorous, energetic and metrically correct in B, are feeble and tentative in A. Yet this impression is erroneous; for if we take some typical instances where B seems most clearly to have improved upon A, we shall find that the received reading of A is found only in a small minority of the A-MSS., and that the bulk of the A-MSS. have the so-called B-reading. Here are some examples:

(A Pro. 76.) Of the pardoner who makes a trade of absolving men from their vows:

> Weore þe Bisschop I-blesset · and worþ boþe his Eres
> Heo scholde not beo so hardi · to deceyue so þe peple.

[1] E.g., Westminster, Ingilby, Rawlinson, Dublin.

[2] For a description of these A-MSS., and an explanation of the symbols used in the footnotes, see below, pp. 373 *seq.*, 384. In the notes orthographic variations are not recorded: the spelling followed is that of the MS. first quoted of each group.

The plural *heo* is strange, for the author is speaking only of one pardoner. His confederate, the parish priest, has not yet been mentioned. The reading of the B-text is at once more lucid and more vigorous: 'If the bishop were worth his ears'—

> His seel shulde nouȝt be sent · to deceyue þe peple (B Pro. 79).

And this is also the reading of nine[1] out of eleven A-MSS.

(A I, 17—21.) The gifts given by Truth to man:

> And for he hihte þe eorþe · to seruen ow vchone....
> And Comaundet of his Cortesye · In Comune þreo þinges;
> Heore nomes beþ neodful.

Yet it is not the names of the things, but the things themselves which are needful: *serue* does not alliterate: *therefore* would give better sense than *for*. All these are found improved in the B-text, and in the overwhelming majority of the A-MSS.[2]:

> And þerfore he hyȝte þe erthe · to help ȝow vchone...
> And comaunded of his curteisye · in *comune* þree þinges;
> Arne none nedful but þo....

(A I, 34.)

> Al nis not good to þe gost · þat þe bodi lykeþ.

Instead of *that the bodi lyketh*, the B-text, and nine out of eleven A-MSS.[3] give *that the gutte(s) axeth* (*lyketh*), which is metrically superior.

(A I, 86.)

> For hose is trewe of his tonge · telleþ not elles,
> Doþ his werkes *þer-with* · and doþ no mon ille,
> He is a-counted to þe gospel · on grounde and on lofte,
> And eke I-liknet to vr lord · bi seint Lucus wordes.
> Clerkes þat knowen hit · scholde techen hit aboute,
> For Cristene and vn-cristene · him cleymeþ vchone.

The repetition of *doth* in the second line is unsatisfactory, with regard alike to sense, style and alliteration. *He is acounted to the gospel* is barely intelligible, and *him cleymeth* is, as we choose to interpret it, either syntactically wrong or an anti-climax: *techen* does

[1] RUEITH$_2$WDL; As *is here defective*; Dig *also reads* seale; *but* Dig *is here rather a* C *than an* A-*text*; V *and* H *alone have the received reading.*

[2] therfore RUEITH$_2$DLDigH; for V; As *defective*; helpe(n) RUEITH$_2$DLDig; serue VHW. U *is corrupt here.*

(n)ar(n) non nedful but þo (þei) RUEITH$_2$DL; E *has* medful *miswritten for* nedful; so nedful as þo W; Ther ar none so nedefull, Dig; As *missing*; *the received reading is given by* VH *only.*

[3] gut REITH$_2$WD, guttes Dig; L *transposes* gost *and* gotte, *but his original had obviously the same reading as the rest*; U *and* As *defective*; bodi VH.

not alliterate. But all this is given rightly in the B-text, and in the great majority of the A-MSS.[1]:

Who-so is trewe of his tonge · & telleth none other,
And doth þe werkis þer-with · and wilneth no man ille,
He is a god bi þe gospel · agrounde and aloft,
And ylike to owre lorde · bi seynte lukes wordes.
Þe clerkes þat knoweþ þis · shulde kenne it aboute
For cristene and vncristne · clameþ it vchone.

(A I, 159—63.)

For Iames þe gentel · bond hit in his Book,
That [Fey] *with*outen [fait] · Is febelore þen nou3t,
And ded as a dore nay̆l · but þe deede folewe.
Chastite *with*outen Charite · (wite þou forsoþe)
Is as lewed as a Laumpe · that no liht is Inne.

The alliteration of the first line is improved in the B-text:

For Iames þe gentil • iugged in his bokes.

and the last sentence is much more powerful:

For-thi chastite with-oute charite · worth cheyned in helle;
It is as lewed as a laumpe · that no li3te is Inne.

But both these readings are found in many A-MSS., whilst those of the received A-text are only found in two[2], the former indeed only in one.

(A II, 5—6.) The words of Holy Church to the poet's question how he may know Falsehood:

'Loke on þe lufthond' q*uo*d heo · 'and seo wher [he] stondeþ,
Boþe Fals and Fauuel • and al his hole Meyne.'

Neither line alliterates satisfactorily: as in the preceding example the received text of A seems to be satisfied with separate alliteration within each half line. More correctly, the B-text has:

Loke vppon þi left half · and lo where he standeth,
Bothe fals and fauel · and here feres manye.

But this is also the reading of the bulk of the A-MSS.[3]

[1] wilneth, willeth *or* will REITH$_2$WDLDig; doth VH. *Skeat, though reading* doth, *prefers* willeth (*see p.* 139).
a god by þe gospel(es) RETWDLDig; in god be ye gospell I; good be gospel H$_2$; a-counted to þe gospel VH. kenne REITH$_2$WDLDig; techen VH.
cleymeth hit, clayme(n) hit EITH$_2$WDLDigH; him cleymeþ V. cleymeþ R. U *and* As *are defective here.*

[2] jugyd, jugyth RUIWLDigAs; demys E (*written for* jugys *by the common interchange of synonyms*); ioynide TH$_2$; hath wryten D; bond hit V; H *has* seyth *in later hand over erasure: the last three letters* ide *of the original are just perceptible.*
chenyd in hell EITH$_2$WDig, *but it may be doubted whether the right* A *reading in spite of inferior alliteration is not* schryned in Helle RUL; shewed in helle D; tenyd in helle As; wite þou forsoþe VH. *There was evidently some corruption in the early copies, and the scribe of the MS. from which* V *and* H *alike derive altered, according to his custom, a word which appeared to him obscure into the colourless and unmetrical* wite thou forsothe. In helle *is added in* T *in a later hand.*

[3] quod heo (he, sche) *omitted* RUTDLDig; *inserted* VHH$_2$*U*WI; EAs *corrupt here.* Lo ETH$_2$WLAs; seo, se VHU*U*DIDig; loke R.
his (her) feres alle (many) RU*U*EITH$_2$WDLAs; Dig *omits line*; al his hole Meyne VH.

After Mede's wedding has been forbidden by Theology, Favel rides with the rest to London, according to the received A-text *feyntly a-tyred* (A II, 140). B has *fetislich* (B II, 165) which is much more appropriate to the attire of one who was to give the bride away. And this is the reading of seven out of twelve A-MSS.[1]

When Liar escaped to the friars, they, to prevent his being known by all comers, according to the received A-text *Kepten him as a Frere* (A II, 206); B has the much more appropriate *coped* (B II, 230) which is also the reading of twelve out of thirteen A-MSS.[2]

(A III, 32.) Mede promises to the clerks who comfort her:

> in Constorie at Court · to tellen heore names.

In B the alliteration is rectified by the reading *do calle* for *tellen*. *Calle* is also the reading of nine out of twelve A-MSS.[3]

(A III, 35.) Those clerks whom Mede loves shall, she boasts, be advanced, where cunning clerks shall 'couche behynde.' *Couche* Skeat interprets 'lie down apart, be left in the lurch,' a somewhat forced use of the word. A much better reading is *clokke*, i.e. 'limp' (Fr. *cloquer*) the reading of B and of nine out of eleven A-MSS.[4]

(A III, 231.) Describing the two kinds of Mede, Conscience contrasts with the true Mede, which God will give, the False Mede beyond Measure:

> Bote þer is a Meede Mesureles · þat Maystrie desyret
> To Meyntene Misdoers · Meede þei taken.

The king above has just said that Mede is worthy 'muche maystrie to haue' but it is difficult to see how Mede Measureless desires mastery, or to whom 'thei' in the next line refers.

The B-text reads:

> There is an-other Mede mesurelees · þat maistres desireth
> To meyntene mysdoers · Mede þei take.

'Another Meed which magistrates covet' (for *masters* = magistrates cf. A III, 67). The context shows the B reading to be right. It is also that of ten out of twelve A-MSS.[5]

[1] fetisliche TWULDig; fetelych I; fetyssy R; fastlyche D; H_2 *has* queyntliche, *having used* fetiliche *above*. Feyntliche VHE. As *is wanting here*.

[2] copyd, copide, copeden, capyd RUEITH_2WDHLDigAs; V *alone* kepten. *See also Skeat's note*, p. 142.

[3] calle, callen, etc. RUEITH_2WLDig; As *wanting here*. tellen VH; telleþ D. *See Skeat*, p. 142.

[4] clocke, klockyn, etc. RUITH_2WLDDig; EAs *defective here*; couche VH.

[5] maysteres RUEITH_2WLDDig; maystrie VH; As *wanting*.

Instances where the imperfect alliteration of the received A-text is corrected in B are very numerous. Here are some:

Þow hast honged on my Nekke · Enleue tymes (A III, 174).

halfe (or *halse*) for *Nekke* is found in B and in ten out of twelve A-MSS.[1]

Among þis Riche Rayes · lernde I a Lessun (A v, 125).

B has *I rendred*, as have eleven out of thirteen A-MSS.[2]

For his wikkede lyf · that he i-liued hedde (A v, 217).

B has *lither life*, as have eleven out of thirteen A-MSS.[3]

For nis no gult her so gret · his Merci nis wel more (A v, 228).

B has *his goodnesse*, as have eight out of eleven A-MSS.[4]

Treuþe wolde loue me þe lasse · a gret while after (A VI, 49).

B has *a longe tyme*, and *long* is also the reading of eleven out of thirteen A-MSS.[5]

Bolde Bidders and Beggers · þat mowen her mete biswinke (A VII, 202).

B has *her bred biswynke*, as have five out of ten A-MSS.[6]

In all the instances given above there is a strong presumption that the difference between the reading of the received text of A and that of the received text of B is not due to corruptions in the MS. which the B-reviser used, but rather to corruptions in the Vernon MS. upon which the received A-text rests.

It is not merely that, of the twelve or thirteen A-MSS. available, all but two in most cases favour the B-reading. For numbers in this matter do not count for all. 'MSS. must be weighed as well as counted,' and it is quite conceivable that the two MSS. might preserve the correct reading, and the ten agree in a corruption. Until we have weighed the MSS. we have no right to argue from the numerical superiority of either group. But we have a right to argue that the reading of the ten is vigorous, picturesque, and metrically accurate, that of the two commonplace and metrically defective. Anyone, therefore, who believes that the received text of A reproduces in these passages the original author's

[1] half RUEITH$_2$WDLDig. *In many of these instances the reading is indisputably* halfe; *in one or two it might be either* halfe *or* halse; As *is wanting*; Nekke VH.
[2] rendred RUEITH$_2$WDLDigAs; lernde VH.
[3] lethyr, liþer RUEITH$_2$WDLDigAs; wikkede VH.
[4] godenesse ITH$_2$WDLDigAs; grace E; Merci VH; RU *omit the line.*
[5] long RUEITH$_2$WDLDigAs; gret VH.
[6] bred RTLDigAs; mete VHUWI; EH$_2$ *wanting*; D *corrupted.*

words, will have to admit that that text received material improvements at the hands of a scribe, whose phrasing was more effective, and whose ideas of metre were more strict, than were those of the original author.

Let us now consider some cases in which the reading of the majority of the A-MSS., which is followed by B, *must* clearly be the original reading. For in these cases the reading of the received text of A (i.e., generally that of V and H) is unintelligible till we see it to be a corruption of the reading which we find in the bulk of the A-MSS., and in the received text of B.

(A I, 54.)

For Rihtfoliche Resoun · schulde rulen ou alle,
And kuynde wit be wardeyn · owre weolþe to kepe,
And tour of vr tresour · to take hit [ȝow] at nede.

A tower may keep treasure, but it cannot possibly hand it to you at need. The right reading is obviously *tutour*, as given by eight out of ten A-MSS.[1], and as followed in the B-text.

(A I, 104.)

[For crist, kyngene kyng · knyhtide tene]
Cherubin *and* Seraphin · an al þe foure ordres—

There are either nine or ten angelic orders, according as the lost angels are, or are not, counted as a separate class.

The reading *an al the foure ordres* can only be the careless writing of a scribe, whose mind was running upon the four orders of friars. The right reading is obviously that of the B-text:

Cherubyn and seraphin · suche seuene and an othre

thus making nine orders of angels, in addition to the tenth order, which fell. And this reading, or a corruption of it, is found in the majority of the A-MSS.[2]

(A III, 41.) The corrupt Friar offers to shrive Mede:

I schal asoyle þe my-self · for a summe of whete.

summe is a manifest miswriting for *seem*, a load, which is the reading of eleven out of thirteen A-MSS.[3], and of the B-text.

(A III, 73.) Of the 'Brewsters, Bakers, Butchers and Cooks' who adulterate food:

þei punisschen þe peple priueliche....

[1] RITH$_2$WDLDig. U *and* As *are here defective*, E *omits the word*; V *and* H *read* tour(e).
[2] such seuene & a noþer, TH$_2$W; suche seuene & oþer D; and such seuene oþer HE; and siche mo oþere U; & seuen moo oyere I; As *wanting*; L *also makes nine orders. The only MSS. giving four orders are* V, H *and* Dig.
[3] summe VH; sem RUEITH$_2$WDLAsDig.

The right reading is obviously *poison*, as B and nine A-MSS., against one which reads *punisschen*; *punish* has come in from four lines above[1].

(A III, 122.) Conscience says, accusing Mede before the king

Vr Fader Adam heo falde · wiþ Feire biheste.

It is difficult to see how Conscience can accuse Mede of this evil act, which was the deed of the enemy in person. Whatever sins may have contributed to Adam's fall, Bribery can hardly be said to have played any part. The true reading is clearly:

Your fadir sche fellide · þurw false byhestes

and 'Your father' is the reading of nine out of twelve A-MSS., followed by B. The reference is to the death of Edward II, for it is abundantly clear from the allusions to the French campaign that the king of the allegory is Edward III. But that several scribes did not understand the passage as a reference to Edward II is certain: one boldly alters 'your father she felled' into 'many men she fells.' The scribe of the Vernon MS. is however alone in his attempt to explain the allusion as a reference to Adam's fall[2].

That the reference is to Edward II rather than to Adam is clear also from Mede's defence; for she understands 'Your father' as referring, not to Adam, but to a king:

(A III, 180.)

For Culde I neuere no kyng · ne counseilede þer-after;
Ne dude i neuere as þou dust · I do hit on þe kyng.

But here there is a further corruption: *I never did as thou dost* or *didst* gives no meaning, we want *as thou judgest*: and this is the reading of nine out of twelve A-MSS., and of the B-text:

Ne dide as þou demist · I do hit on þe kyng[3].

[1] poysone RUEITH$_2$DLDig; perrechyn As *through the scribe's eye catching* rechyn *in the line below*; appose *altered to* appresse W. pylen H; punisschen V *only*.

[2] 3our fadir sche fellide UREIH$_2$WDL; As *is missing here*; T has 3oure fadir he fellide; H fele men heo falliþ; Dig our Father sche fylyd; V *alone has* Vr Fader Adam heo falde. Skeat points out (Clarendon Press edition, vol. II, p. 45) that the reading of the received A-text must here be erroneous. Cf. too on this point a most valuable article by E. Teichmann in *Anglia*, XV, 224—5. Teichmann obviously doubted whether the Vernon MS. justifies the confidence which has been placed in its text of *Piers Plowman*.

[3] demest UEITH$_2$WDLDig; dost RV; didest H; As *wtg*.

The conclusion of the indictment of Mede by Conscience in the received A-text is hardly intelligible (III, 264):

> Þe Culor*um* of þis [clause] · kepe I not to schewe,
> In Auenture hit [nuy3ed] me · an ende wol I make:
> ¶ And riht as Agag hedde · hapne schulle su*mm*e;
> Samuel schal slen him · and Saul schal be blamet,
> Dauid schal ben Dyademed · and daunten hem alle,
> And on cristene kyng · kepen vs vchone.
> Concience knowe*þ* þis; for kuynde wit me tau3te
> Þat Resun schal regne · and Reames gou*er*ne.

Lines have been misplaced: the passage should run as it does in the B-text, and in eleven out of thirteen A-MSS.

> The culor*um* of þis cas · kepe I nou3te to shewe;
> An auenture it noyed men · none ende wil I make....
> I Conscience knowe þis · for kynde witt me it tau3te
> That resou*n* shal regne · and rewmes gouerne;
> And ri3te as agag hadde · happe shul so*mm*e
> Samuel shal sleen hym · and Saul shal be blamed
> And dauid shal be diademed · and daunten hem alle,
> And one cristene kynge · kepen hem alle[1].

Among the disreputable company in the Alehouse is given

(A v, 164.)

> Dauwe þe disschere.

But this is clearly wrong, for we have 'Rose þe disschere' only two lines below. The scribe's eye has caught the second word and he has miswritten Dawe's occupation. Dawe is a ditcher, not a dish-seller: he is mentioned subsequently ('Dawe þe dyker' B VI, 331 'Dawe þe deluere' C IX, 354). And *dykere* is the reading of the B-text and of eight out of thirteen A-MSS.[2]

(A VIII, 29—35.) Among the works of public munificence by which merchants may make friends of mammon, are mentioned, together with the building of hospitals and bridges, and the endowing of nuns, widows and scholars:

> And wikkede wones · wihtly to amende...
> Rule Religion · and Rente hem betere.

[1] RUEITH$_2$WDLADig; VH *alone have wrong order.*
Some confusion was caused by the scribes forgetting that Conscience is speaking: I consciens *is found only in* IWLHAs. D *reads* yf concience. *Elsewhere it is generally corrupted to* 'In conciens knowe I' RTH$_2$UDig; E *omits the second* I.

[2] dykere RUITH$_2$WDDig; L *is corrupt here,* AsE *have* drynkere, *which no doubt describes Dawe accurately enough, but would not sufficiently differentiate him from his fellows in the tavern;* VH *alone* disschere. *Here again, cf. Skeat's note,* (Cl. Press), p. 91, *and Teichmann in Anglia* XV, p. 226.

Wones cannot be right. To keep one's property in repair is only an act of common sense. The right reading must be *wikked wayes*, as in B and eleven out of twelve A-MSS.[1]

Merchants obviously do not rule, but relieve, religious houses, as in B and eight out of eleven A-MSS.[2]

(A VIII, 79.) Beggars mutilate their children, in order that they may beg the better, for

> þer ben mo mis-happes among*us* hem · hose takeþ heede
> þen of alle o*þur*e men · þat on Molde wandren.

Skeat explains 'they are always meeting with accidents' which hardly agrees with the context. The B-text has *There is moo mysshape peple* —that there are more deformed among them than among other folk is a proof that they mutilate their children. And this is the reading of eight out of eleven A-MSS.[3]

Notwithstanding these and similar blemishes, the merits of the Vernon text are undeniable. Yet the very goodness of the Vernon MS., when regarded as an isolated version, sometimes diminishes its value as a means of restoring the original text of the poem. For the intelligibility of Vernon is often the result of the scribe or his predecessor having deliberately smoothed away the difficulties he found in his original. It is natural that a scribe, engaged in copying and turning into his own speech poems often written in widely differing dialects, should become something of an editor. Sometimes he makes a slip, and we can detect him at work. We have seen how, not understanding the reference to Mede having slain King Edward II, he made her slay father Adam[4].

Again, turn to VIII, 106, where the author obviously wrote:

> þe prophete his payn eet · in penauns and wepyng....
> *Fuerunt michi lacrime panes*

a reading which is kept in MSS. U, I, L.

But the word *payn* was evidently not understood, and most of the scribes bungled over it. T has nonsense, *the prophet his peyned*, R has only very halting sense, *the prophete his peyne hath*[5]. Alone among the

[1] wyckede weyes RUITH$_2$WDLADigH; wones V; E *wanting here.*
[2] releyue RITH$_2$DLDigH; rule UWV; EAs *wanting here.*
[3] mysshape, myschapyn RUITWDL; mishappes VH; myschapmen H$_2$; EAs *wanting*; mischef*es* Dig.
[4] That this is the work of the V, and not of the common original of V and H is clear: for H, equally puzzled, has edited the passage in another and even more violent way 'many men she fells.' H goes further, and also smoothes away the subsequent passage where Mede defends herself from the charge of having killed the king. V, more honest than his fellow H, has abstained from telling a second lie to cover up the tracks of his first.
[5] Over an erasure. Probably the scribe first wrote *penaunce.*

MSS. of the first class V and H have not only 'sophisticated' the passage, but have done so cleverly. V has 'The prophetes peyneden hem · in penaunce and wepyng.' H has, still more ingeniously 'Ther is profyt in peyne' etc.

It is the very cleverness of these plausible corruptions which makes their danger. A scribe who is intelligent enough to do this kind of thing, is likely to mislead us more than a bungler who copies, more or less incorrectly, the text before him. What Dr Moore has remarked of the early MSS. of the *Divine Comedy* is equally true of the MSS. of *Piers Plowman*: their writers are not exact copyists, but editors, although working without an editor's sense of responsibility. But whilst this applies, to some extent, to all the MSS., it is particularly applicable to Vernon, and to one or two others, including Vernon's nearest relative, Harleian 875 (H), which is perhaps more given to editing than even V, though there is not space to quote instances here.

Had this been all, it might have been possible to correct V and H, the one from the other. But unfortunately it is clear from the instances quoted above, where V and H so often agree in one and the same variant, that the common ancestor of V and H was also an 'edited' MS., whose scribe was ready to replace a difficult or perhaps corrupt word by a commonplace tag. Many further examples of this might be quoted. Theology forbids the marriage between Mede and False; for Mede is a lady, the daughter of Amends—just compensation—and God's will is that she should be wedded to Truth. The passage runs in B, as it probably ran in the original A:

> For Mede is moylere · of Amendes engendred,
> And god graunteth to gyf · Mede to Treuthe. (B II, 119.)

But, though a very early corruption, which all but one or two A-MSS. share, (*A*)*mendes* was altered to the senseless *Frendes*[1]. The scribe whose work underlies VH, tried to make sense by a reckless alteration of the passage. At the same time he corrupted the word *moylere*, which apparently he did not understand. So the passage ran in the archetype of V and H:

> For Mede is a Medeler · a Mayden of goode,
> God graunte us to giue her · ther treuthe wol asigne [or assente].

The Vernon scribe did not understand *Medeler*, and so altered to *Iuweler*, i.e., one bedecked with or owning jewels, a word appropriate

[1] For mede is (a) muliere of frendis engendryt RUTH$_2$D: E tries to improve the sense by altering *frendis* to *fendes*. LIDig give the right reading *Mendes*, but almost certainly in Dig, possibly in I, this may be regarded as the correction of a scribe who supplied the right word from his knowledge of a B or C text. Ashmole is defective here.

enough to Mede in general, though certainly not in this context. Hence we get the reading of the received A-text:

> For Meede is a Iuweler · A Mayden of goode,
> God graunte vs to ȝiue hire · ther treuþe wol asigne.

Or again, in V, 129, the poet seems to have written

> My wyf was a wynnestre and wollen cloþ made (so RETDL),

wynster meaning a woman making money. We have not met the word elsewhere, but it seems a quite possible one, and is supported by the use of *winner* meaning a workman ('winners with handen' C I, 222) and *win* meaning to earn one's living (A I, 153). Yet we can understand the scribes being puzzled by the word, and altering it. U changes to the senseless, but graphically very close *breustere*: more intelligently $IH_2WDigAs$ have *webstere, webbere*[1] etc. But the scribe whose work underlies V and H, was not satisfied with so simple an alteration. He wrote:

> And my wyf at Westmunstre · that wollene cloth made.

Most of the scribes were puzzled by the name of *one Waryn Wisdom*, who, with Witty, rides to court (IV, 24 etc.). *Waryn* was not understood as a proper name, and corrupted to *were, warned, wary*. The ancestor of V and H remedied the passage by making Wisdom and Witty ride to court *on a wayn*.

Many other instances of this 'editing' might be quoted: the most striking, however, is in Passus X, 188, etc., where the poet speaks of the ill-assorted marriages of folk who will never win the Dunmow flitch without perjury:

> Þeiȝ þei don hem to dunmowe but ȝif þe deuil helpe
> To folewe aftir þe flicche fecche þei it neuere
> But ȝif þei boþe be forsworn þat bacoun þei tyne.
> For þi I counseile alle cristene couette not be weddid
> ffor coueitise of catel or of kynrede riche;
> But maidenis and maidenis macche ȝow ysamme
> Wydeweris & wydewis werchiþ riȝt also
> And glade ȝe god þat al good sendiþ[2].

[1] This seems simpler than the alternative supposition that RETDL independently agreed in corrupting the familiar *webster* into the unfamiliar *winster*. Also, if the original reading were *webster*, we should have no reason for the variants of U and VH. The confusion of the MSS. shows that the original reading must have been a difficult and puzzling one. Had *winster* been found only in one group of MSS. and *webster* in the others, we might have supposed that *webster* had been corrupted to *winster* through the scribe's eye catching *spinster* immediately below. But RETDL are no single group.

[2] *þeiȝ*] *om.* RUDAsW. *don hem*] hiden hem RU; be don D; hien hym welfast W. *dunmowe*] don now I. *but...helpe*] *om.* W. *ȝif*] *om.* UI. *þe deuil*] dowel As. *folewe aftir*] fechen W. *flicche*] flesche R, flysh W. *fecche*] fatte As cache W. *ȝif*] *om.* UAsW. *þei*] *om.* As. *forsworn*] forswon R.

So the passage runs in the MS. of Trinity College, Cambridge: the variants of the other MSS.—except V—are given below. The variants of the Ingilby scribe show that he or his original did not understand the allusion to Dunmow, and objected to applying the word maiden to a bachelor. Ingilby therefore corrupts (probably unintentionally) *dunmow* to *don now*, and (intentionally) *maidenis* to *sengil*.

But the Vernon text represents the version of a scribe who was not content to copy faithfully an unintelligible passage. He makes it bear a superficial appearance of sense.

> Þauȝ þei don hem to done · al þat þei mowen
> To folewen aftur þe Flucchen · fecche þei hit neuere
> Bote ȝif þei boþe ben forswore · and Cursen þat tyme.
> Forþi I Counseile alle Cristene · coueite not ben I-weddet
> For Couetyse of Catel · ne of kun Riche,
> Bote Maydens and vn-Maydens · clene ow saue
> Widewers and widewes · worschupeþ also
> And þenne glade ȝe god · þat alle goodes sendeþ.

We cannot be certain if this last piece of editing is due to V or to the common source of VH, for H is here wanting. In view of the other instances quoted, however, it is most likely that, if we had H, we should find him erring with V.

But not only does this common source edit corrupt passages: the scribe has another serious fault, that of substituting one synonym for another, more particularly with a view to excluding a word which he does not like, even at the expense of ruining the alliteration. This is a common fault, but the VH scribe seems to have possessed it to an uncommon degree[1]. The most characteristic instance is the systematic substitution of *teach* for *ken*.

for þi] þer for I, *om.* As.
couette] þei couyte R. *be*] to be RUAsDigW; *wedded begins next line in* W; to wedde D.
or of] or for RU; ne of IDigW; and of As. *kynrede*] kyn IW.
maidenis and maidenis] sengil and madenys I; maydenis As.
macche ȝow ysamme] ȝow to same takyn RU; marie ȝou togyderis H_2; makkyth ȝou same I; mache ȝou þe same D; matche you togeders Dig W; meke ȝou to gederis As.
wydeweris & wydewis] transposed I. *riȝt also*] ȝe al so RU; the same H_2; right so Dig; ȝe þe same AsW. *And*] þanne RU; and þan I, DigW.
þat al good sendiþ] and alle goode saintz W. *good*] godes RUI. As *omits the last line.*

[1] Pro. 14 tryly, triȝely RUETH_2WDig. *The word was a difficult one, for* IDL *alter to* trulyche, treoweliche, etc.; wonderliche VH. As *is wanting in the Prologue.*
Pro. 41 bratful bredful RUTH_2DL. *This again was clearly a difficult word, for* E *reads* with bred full *and* WIDig ful, fully; faste VH. Of bred ful *is also the reading of the received text of the B version*: bretful *reappears in the C-text.*
Sometimes the alteration of the VH scribe appears quite wanton, as when he changes *hold* to *give* (I, 9, hold þei no tale RUEITH_2WDLDig: ȝeueþ þei no tale VH; As wanting) or *wisse* to *teach* (I, 72 wyssed etc. REITH_2WDLDig; techeþ V tawght H; UAs wanting) or *tie* to *bind* (I, 94 teiȝe hem faste REITH_2DLDig; bynde(n) VHW; UAs wanting) or *catel* to *meed* (IV, 69 catel RUEITH_2WDLDigAs; meede VH). Whilst the interchange of

These, and other instances too numerous to quote, throw suspicion upon V, H, and their common source. However plausible be the text presented by V and, in the main, supported by H, we cannot accept it without demur when we see that the scribes of these MSS. were improvers, who took such great liberties with their originals. And the support which V receives from H, and in virtue of which Skeat often allows a doubtful V-reading to stand, is invalidated when we see that V and H alike go back to a somewhat corrupt original.

But, further, it may be doubted whether V has even the character which we have hitherto allowed it, of presenting a text better in itself —or at least more plausible—than that of the other MSS. Here it is difficult to avoid arguing in a circle. The best MSS. are clearly those which give the best readings: and in deciding what are the best readings we shall ultimately have to place much, though not all, our reliance upon the evidence of what we have decided to be the best MSS. The four MSS. which Skeat selected, with justice, as being the four best available when he printed the A-text were:

V. The Vernon MS. in the Bodleian, wanting after XI, 180 (see Skeat, pp. xv—xvii).

H. Harl. 875 in the British Museum, wanting after VIII, 144 (see Skeat, pp. xvii—xviii).

T. Trinity College, Cambridge, R. 3. 14 (see Skeat, pp. xviii—xix).

U. University College, Oxford (see Skeat, pp. xix—xx).

Let us examine the individual readings of each of these MSS. *on their own merits,* trying not to allow ourselves to be influenced by considerations drawn from the number of MSS. which agree or disagree in each case. The results will, of course, be quite provisional, for

synonyms is a general fault, the source of VH was peculiarly addicted to it, as is shown by the following examples, in all of which the alliteration demands *ken* not *teach*:

I, 79 kenne EITH$_2$WLDig; teche VHRD; UAs *wanting*.
I, 90 kenne REITH$_2$WDLDig; VH teche; UAs *wtg*.
I, 127 kenne UITH$_2$WDLDig; teche VHR; lere E; As *wtg*.
II, 4 ken RU*U*EITH$_2$WDLDigAs; teche VH.
VI, 30 kennyd, *etc.* RUETH$_2$WDLDigAs; tau3te VHI.
VII, 23 kennest RUEILDigAsH; techest VTH$_2$WD.
VII, 25 kenne UEITH$_2$WDLDigAs; kene R; teche V; H *wtg*.
VIII, 120 kennyd UITH$_2$WDLDig; tau3te VHRAs; E *wtg*.
IX, 50 bekenne RUITH$_2$WDigAs; beotake V; ELH *wtg*.

Skeat points out in his critical notes (A-text *E.E.T.S.*, p. 139) that in I, 79, 90, 127 we might with advantage read *kenne*, but adds 'I have preferred leaving the text intact to making *three* alterations.' Yet in point of fact there is less violence in making three alterations than in making one. The case for alteration is strengthened with each succeeding instance in which we find Vernon reading *teach* and the alliteration demanding *ken*: in the later passus Skeat, in fact, usually abandons the Vernon reading in these cases.

subsequently MS. authority may—and indeed will—lead us to think that in some cases what we have condemned as the inferior reading, must be the actual words of the original writer, and that what we have regarded as the better reading, is only the felicitous corruption of an isolated scribe. But we cannot invoke MS. authority yet: we have still to decide where it lies.

If, up to the point where Vernon breaks off, we compare it with the other three MSS. which Skeat collated with it, we get the following results:

	In V.	In H, *up to* VIII, 144[1].	In T.	In U.
1. Necessary lines or words omitted	32	16	17	34
2. Good lines or words omitted	33	20	18	29
3. Reading distinctly inferior	208	194	131	217
4. Reading somewhat inferior	44	42	42	47

From classes 2 and 4 we cannot with safety argue; for a quite good line or word may be due to interpolation in a certain group of MSS. rather than to deficiency in the others. When the sense or the alliteration appears to *demand* a word or a reading, we can argue with greater approximation to certainty; thus adding together classes 1 and 3 we get:

Against	V	240 errors
„	H	210 „
„	T	148 „
„	U	251 „

But U has gaps of some 120 lines, and H of some 630. If we allow U an average of 13 blunders for these lost passages and H an average of 77, we get the following results, grouping the MSS. in order of merit on the strength of our rough test.

T	148 errors
V	240 „
U	264 „
H	287 „

Of course no exact value can be claimed for these figures, but this examination has satisfied us that V has no extraordinary value, above TU and H.

But the real question is not the value of any individual MS., but of

[1] Where H breaks off.

each group. There is no necessity to argue, what has been recognized by all students of the subject, that V and H form one group and T and U another. If anyone wishes to satisfy himself of this afresh, five minutes' study of Skeat's footnotes, taken at random anywhere, would prove it. By a comparison of V with H and of T with U we can eliminate the more obvious blunders peculiar to the later scribes, and get a good idea of the original MSS. from which each pair, VH and TU, ultimately derive.

But in the VH group this comparison can only go as far as Passus VIII, 144, where H breaks off suddenly, leaving V for the rest of the poem unsupported. Examining the blunders up to this point charged against V and H, we find that 63 were common to both, and were therefore presumably inherited from the common ancestor, which we will call φ.

Of the blunders made up to this point by T and U, only 22 are common to both, and therefore presumably inherited from their common original, which we will call τ.

We can therefore correct φ from τ some three times as often as we can correct τ from φ. τ, having fewer blunders is, then, presumably nearer to the original archetype of the A-text.

On the evidence, then, of the four MSS. of which full collations have been published, we are led to suspect that, whilst neither the TU tradition nor the VH tradition is to be despised in our search after the original A-text, the greater weight is to be placed upon the TU tradition.

Yet this tradition has hitherto been quite neglected, except in those few cases where the reading of VH was so obviously wrong as to compel recourse to it[1].

A survey of the MSS. which have hitherto been only partially or not at all collated will, we think, strengthen the impression already gained, of the weight of the TU tradition[2].

[1] Passages where there appears to be a corruption or confusion common to both VH and TU are, *for the present*, left out of consideration.

[2] Current knowledge of these MSS. rests upon the examination of them made by Skeat at different times, the results of which were published, some in his A-text (*E.E.T.S.*), and some in his *Parallel Extracts*. These results are necessarily tentative, but cautious, and, so far as they attempt to go, exceedingly valuable. An elaborate tree, showing the interdependence of the fourteen A-MSS., has been published by Dr Kron in his *William Langleys Buch von Peter dem Pflüger*, 1885. This has been accepted as authoritative by Brandl (*D.L.Z.*, 1886, p. 518), and even by Skeat, who says 'Dr Kron...has examined the less important MSS. with greater care than I gave to them.... I therefore follow his classification.'

Dr Kron appears to have seen most of the MSS.; but he has not recorded a single reading of a single A-MS. which he has not derived from Skeat. Indeed he admits (p. 20)

Some of these uncollated MSS. are merely descendants of τ, and therefore only prove that τ was more prolific than, not necessarily superior to, φ. Yet these MSS. are worth examining; for they all help us to fix more exactly the text of the original τ. Three of them seem to be related by a remarkable characteristic to T. These are:

(Brit. Mus.) MS. Harl. 6041 [H_2] (see Skeat's A-text, *E.E.T.S.* pp. xx, xxi).

(Bodleian) MS. Digby 145 [Dig] (see Skeat's A-text, p. xxiv).

The Duke of Westminster's MS. [W] (see Skeat's *Parallel Extracts*, p. 25).

Now these MSS., TH_2DigW, instead of ending, as many other MSS. do, with Passus XI, continue from that point with the C-text. This joining on of C to A *might* of course have been done independently, but in one case at least it is certain, and in the others it seems most likely, that this common characteristic is due to the MSS. having been copied ultimately from one MS. 't,' which had had the C-text appended to it in this way. When 't' is spoken of as a combination of A and C, it does not mean that the scribe has attempted to amalgamate a C and an A text by splicing the two together throughout: he has merely added to a pure A-text the later passus of the C-text. Such 'combined texts' must then be carefully distinguished from the 'combined texts' with which we shall have to deal later: texts produced apparently by a scribe who had before him two MSS. and systematically contaminated both.

That H_2 is closely allied to T, does not need demonstration. Skeat says 'After collating it closely with the text from the beginning down to l. 146 of Passus II I ceased doing so; finding that it is, practically, little else than an inferior duplicate of T, and may be neglected without much loss.' And, indeed, for fifty or a hundred lines together H_2 sometimes reads as if it were a mere transcript of T. Yet it is not, for, of 126 blunders made by T in those passages common to T and H_2—for H_2 is defective—nineteen are not shared by H_2. And even when H_2 blunders together with T, it is sometimes with a difference which helps us to see what the reading of T's original was, and why T went wrong.

that his examination of the MSS. was quite perfunctory. Whatever, therefore, may be the value of his work in other directions, it is not only useless but misleading with reference to the relationship of the A-MSS. Dr Kron has only restated dogmatically Skeat's tentative results. He has added a large number of serious errors; as when (p. 23) he quotes eleven instances between Pass. I, 34 and I, 90 in which he asserts that U agrees with VH as against T and T's cognates. Such an agreement would be most abnormal. As a matter of fact a leaf is here missing from U. U consequently does not appear in Skeat's footnotes as differing from VH, and Dr Kron, overlooking Skeat's repeated entry as to U's deficiency, has assumed that U agrees with VH.

On the other hand, H_2 has a large number of mistakes peculiar to itself. Its chief value is that it enables us to eliminate the worst blunders of the last scribe of T, and to restore to some extent the text of his original.

From another point of view H_2 is interesting. It has had corrections written in by a later hand. These corrections seem to have been made on no very clearly intelligible principle. Three or four of them, however, could only have been made by a man who was familiar with the earlier passus of the poem in the B or C version. Had H_2 been copied again, we should have had in the copy a characteristic A-text of the T-type with a few puzzling and sporadic B-readings.

Much more puzzling is the problem presented by the Digby MS. (Dig). This MS. must have been copied from *two* originals: the one an A-MS, with or without the C continuation; the other a C-MS. The scribe began with an attempt to combine the two systematically. The first five lines have the typical C peculiarities; then follow eight lines as they occur in the A and B texts, these lines being for the most part wanting in the C-text; then four C lines; then two lines as in A; a line and a half as in C; then A again. After two hundred lines or so of this laborious contamination, the scribe grew tired, and threw down his pen. When the copying is resumed, in a slightly altered hand, the A version is followed fairly consistently[1], and only rarely contaminated[2]. W likewise has been contaminated by interpolations from a B type, and apparently also from a C type. It is unnecessary to enumerate these interpolations, as the most important instances in the earlier passus will be found in Skeat's *Parallel Passages*[3].

T, then, is not very efficiently backed up by the MSS. most closely related to it. H_2 is so close as to afford comparatively little check; and the fact that Dig and W have been thus contaminated greatly invalidates their evidence. In many places their reading will not be a

[1] E.g. in the following passages, where B makes additions, alterations or omissions, the Digby scribe adheres to A. A I, 1, 4, 31 (where however one line of the B-C addition has been afterwards added between the lines), 110 etc., 119 etc., 129 etc., 136 etc., 174; II, 11 etc., 17, 19 etc., 33, 40 etc., 64 etc., 84, 178—9; III, 90, 173, 228 etc., 249, 282 etc.; IV, 18, 116, 133 etc., 138, 141 etc., 146 etc.; V, 10, 28; VII, 10 etc., 38 etc., 45 etc., 66 etc., 110, 134 etc., 166 etc., 180 etc., 212 etc., 301 etc., 311 etc.; VIII, 8, 13 etc., 39 etc., 43 etc., 49 etc., 58, 72 etc., 99 etc., 105, 122.

[2] E.g. V, 42. There is some contamination also among the Seven Deadly Sins. Glutton makes his confession according to the A version: he is then made to fall into a swoon from which he is aroused by vigilate the veyle—this passage being borrowed from the subsequent confession of Sloth. On recovering he makes a second confession according to the B-text. The B-additions to Sloth are also given. Cf. also VI, 82 etc.; 96 etc.

[3] pp. 25, 26.

genuine A-reading at all, but a reading reflected back from the B-C-recensions. Except in those passages where the B-text has departed entirely from the A-text, we shall not then be able to use the evidence of Dig and W; or at any rate we shall have to use it only with the utmost caution.

Much more helpful is the support afforded to U by its nearest cognates. These are:

(Bodleian) MS. Rawlinson Poet. 137 (R), see Skeat's A-text 142*; Trinity College, Dublin D. 4. 12 (E), see Skeat's B-text, p. vi, footnote.

Both these were discovered during the publication of Prof. Skeat's monumental edition in the *E.E.T.S.*, but too late to be used in the formation of the A-text, except quite at the end. Consequently no collations of these MSS. have been published. Yet they are of great importance: R is in some respects equal, in one at least superior to U. RUE are descended from one original. In this original apparently two leaves had got misplaced; for alike in R, U and E we find ll. 71—213 or 216 of Passus VII inserted after l. 182 of Passus I[1]. E, apparently, was not copied directly from this source. There are signs that the most immediate original of E was a transcript which had been corrected and interpolated from a copy of the B-text. This would account for the B-lines which occur sporadically in E. We shall therefore have to be careful not to take the evidence of E in any case where the true reading could have been ascertained from a B-text, unless that reading is supported also by E's uncontaminated fellows. E, however, still has value, as it will enable us to decide between its nearest relatives U and R when they differ.

The existence of these MSS., Digby, Dublin, Westminster (and, we may add, Harleian 3954), all showing a greater or less amount of features characteristic of the B or C versions, raises a question of great importance as to the manner in which the author, or authors, issued his, or their work, a question, too, which must be settled before we can get any further in our study of MS. relationships. Did the author issue

[1] Another peculiarity of this group is the protest against Love-Days:

Vicars on fele halue · fonden hem to done
Leders þei be of louedays · and with þe lawe medle.

The lines are found, with two others, in E. They are also found in R, but a blank space is left where the word *Vicars* should occur. By reason probably of this undecipherable word, the whole passage is omitted in U.

from time to time additions to his work, so as to give rise to series of transitional texts, between A and B? This last explanation was that adopted by Prof. Skeat, and it has been lately fully and persuasively stated by M. Jusserand. Jusserand supposes that Langland, like Montaigne, kept his work by him and was ever making additions in the margin, or on slips of parchment: 'Tentative additions, written by the author on the margin or on scraps, to be later definitely admitted or not into the text, were inserted haphazard anywhere by some copyists, and let alone by others[1]. In his next revision the poet never failed to remove a number of errors left in the previous text, always, however, forgetting a few. As shown by the condition of MSS., the poet let copyists transcribe his work at various moments, when it was in the making (it was indeed ever in the making) and was in a far from complete and perfect state; sometimes when part or the whole of an episode was lacking, or when it ended with a canto or passus merely sketched and left unfinished. The scribes who copied the MS. Harl. 875 and the Lincoln's Inn MS. had apparently before them an original of version A, containing only the first eight passus, that is, the episodes of Meed and Piers.'

Now it may be that, when the evidence of the MSS. has been finally sifted, there will be left over certain passages supporting this theory. But certainly the bulk of the phenomena which might seem at first sight to support it, on further examination do not do so. Thus, the fact that Harleian 875 and the Lincoln's Inn MS. go no further than Passus VIII, is a sheer accident. Both MSS. have been mutilated; and whether in each case a few lines or three passus have been torn away from the end, there is no evidence in the MS. itself to show. But Harleian 875 is copied, beyond doubt, from the same original as Vernon; and Vernon goes to Passus XI. There is no evidence whatever, then, that the Lincoln's Inn MS. was copied from an original version of A containing only the first eight passus; whilst there is strong evidence that Harleian 875 was copied from an original containing at least some eleven passus.

Again, with regard to the lines found in Harleian 875 alone, M. Jusserand's theory apparently is that they were added as an afterthought by the writer, and therefore are wanting in other A-texts; whilst they were subsequently either lost or cancelled, and are therefore

[1] 'Of this sort are, to all appearances, the additional lines in the MS. Harl. 875 of A, not to be found elsewhere, especially the two passages giving, as in a parenthesis, some supplementary touches, on Fals and on Favel, one of four and the other of three lines.'—(Jusserand.)

wanting in the B and C texts. And this would be a very possible theory, if the lines were found both in Vernon and Harleian 875. But they are found in Harleian 875 alone. If the lines are genuine, not the additions of H, but copied from his original, how comes it that they are not to be found in Vernon, copied from the same original?

Precisely the same line of argument leads us to suppose that the B-lines in E cannot be derived from the archetype of E, but are the independent additions of a scribe, made from his knowledge of a B or C text. For, that E is ultimately a copy of the same original as U and R, is certain. Innumerable peculiarities, and above all the odd transposition of some of the matter, prove this. Yet these B-lines do not occur in RU.

In like manner, the peculiarities of the Digby MS. cannot be explained as due to that MS. being copied from a first draft of the B-text, in which only a few of the B-additions, such as the rat-fable, as yet appear. On the contrary, minute examination shows that the MS. is compounded from at least two others; and we can almost see the scribe at work, writing now a few lines from his A-text original, now a few from his C-text.

We are compelled therefore, however reluctantly, to believe that this B-element in A-MSS. is due to the 'sophistication' of later scribes, and accordingly to doubt the evidence of these 'sophisticated' MSS.

We have found the MSS. so far considered, to fall into two great classes; one represented by V and H, derived from an original *f*. This *f* we cannot reconstruct with any degree of certainty. For where V and H differ, and they differ frequently, it will be very difficult to decide between them. In many cases, it is true, the reading of V, and still more often that of H, is obviously unmetrical or nonsensical. But often the differences are of such a character as to make it difficult to choose. Since we do not yet know exactly what laws of alliteration the author of the A-text observed, we shall often hesitate, even when one reading seems metrically superior. We shall be driven in reconstructing our theoretical *f*, to the rather desperate course of following V, which is on the whole a much surer guide than H, except in those cases where H offers a clearly better reading. We cannot by this means hope to reconstruct exactly the original *f*; but we get something nearer than we should if we adopted either of the other courses open to us (1) that of following H, except where V is clearly better, or (2) tossing a penny in all doubtful cases.

Our reconstructed γ is then, after all, a somewhat doubtful quantity.

Our second group of MSS. consists of TH_2WDigRUE, and we have seen that these subdivide into two sub-groups, distinguished each by a remarkable characteristic: TH_2WDig (the T group) and URE (the U group). Although, as we have seen, the MS. T is much better than MS. U, there is nevertheless not much to choose between these two sub-groups. For the MSS. we have classed with T do not help us much: H_2 is too close to T to be of more than secondary value as a check; W and Dig are suspect by reason of B-contamination. Indeed, owing to this cross relationship, it becomes exceedingly difficult to make out what the real affinities of W and Dig are. Much more efficient is the checking and support which U derives from R and E; for E is not affected by B-influence to the same extent as are Dig and W.

The T group and the U group fortunately do not differ very much: when they do they are of so nearly equal value that in many cases there is little to choose. Here we want an arbitrator; unless in all readings where there is no clear superiority, we are to be again at the mercy of chance.

Here we may perhaps be helped by the partially collated D—Douce 323 in the Bodleian. 'This MS.,' says Skeat, 'follows T rather closely, but is full of gross blunders. On this account, after collating with Passus I—IV I desisted, finding that it only tended to choke the footnotes with inferior readings.'

Yet Douce might repay careful collation throughout. It belongs clearly, like H_2R and E, to the TU group; yet it seems, within that group, not to fall very clearly either into the TH_2 section or into the RUE section, though in many cases it goes with TH_2 against RUE. Indeed, with all its many and serious corruptions, Douce has sometimes preserved the right reading where both T and U are obviously wrong. Of course Douce is constantly straying independently. But with such good guides as TRU, we shall hardly be misled into any of D's corruptions; whilst D will help us considerably in reconstructing the common original. Here and there, though rarely, D will enable us to get a better reading than either T or RU supply; but D's chief function will be to decide the balance between the readings of T and of RU, where these differ without a clear advantage on either side.

We have seen that the TU tradition is apparently more correct than the VH tradition, in so far as it gives us fewer common blunders. We are therefore fortunate in having eight MSS. of this class TH_2DigWRUED to help us to establish the text of the original

MS. of this type, and to reduce the number of common blunders to a somewhat smaller figure. At the same time the more uncertain VH tradition cannot be neglected, since, as we have seen, it preserves what appears to be the right reading in some twenty-two instances where the T group and the RU group both seem to be wrong, and where, in all but two cases, D is also wrong.

And we may be certain that for one instance where the correctness of VH can be proved, there are many where VH are right though we cannot prove it; for only in a minority of the cases in which the two traditions vary, can we definitely declare either tradition right in virtue of intrinsic superiority alone.

What we therefore need is a MS. independent alike of the VH and of the TU group. Such a MS. would not be useless, even were it very corrupt; for, as Dr Johnson charitably observed, even the greatest liar may speak more truth in his lifetime than untruth. The important thing is that we should be certain of this MS. being independent of either family.

Let us now examine the Lincoln's Inn MS. [L], which is thus described by Skeat: 'On comparing a transcript of a considerable number of lines kindly made for me by Dr Furnivall, I found that the text had been much corrupted by the scribe, and that to collate it would only fill the footnotes with false readings, except in places where the text is sufficiently ascertained without it. The corruptions are due to an inordinate love of alliteration....Careful examination of the MS. shows, in fact, that it is best dismissed.' Indeed the corruptions of L are so numerous and so violent that to use it as the basis of a text would be absurd. Yet it may be of value in helping us to decide between the conflicting readings of our two good traditions VH and TU, especially as the corruptions of L are, as Skeat states, due to an excessive love of alliteration, whilst those of VH and TU often involve a disregard of it. It is exceedingly unlikely that VH and L, or TU and L, will often agree in making the same change, unless there is a relationship between them. That L is independent of both the VH and the TU group seems however clear. We have seen that V and H are characterized by 63 common blunders, in places where T or U or both give the correct reading. In 53 cases L gives the right reading in agreement with T or U: in seven L is corrupt or illegible, differing alike from VH and from TU; though indeed, in many cases the corruption is evidently a miswriting of the reading of TU. In three

instances only does L go wrong with VH, and these three are of such a character that the resemblance may well be accidental. That L does not belong to the VH group seems then fairly clear. T and U, we have seen, agree in offering a reading inferior to that of V in twenty-two instances: (if we include D, TUD offer an inferior reading in only twenty instances). Of the twenty-two cases where we have judged TU inferior to VH, L agrees with VH in fifteen, is wanting in one, and agrees with TU in six. Six cases of common blundering would be enough to prove some connection, though slight, between TU and L. But on scrutinizing these six instances we find that in each case the inferiority of the TUL reading consists only in the line not running or alliterating as well as that offered by VH. In no case, however, is the TUL reading an impossible one; and in each case the TUL reading is backed up by all the extant MSS., except VH. In two cases even H deserts V, and goes with TUL and the rest. There seems then a strong presumption that in these six cases TU and L do, after all, give the original reading, and that the variant given, sometimes by V alone, sometimes by V and H, is only an example of the desire so frequently shown by scribes, of improving the alliteration.

The agreement in these six cases of TU and L does not therefore prove any connection between L and the TU group; and we have seen that there is no connection between L and the VH group.

Further, there are passages where a very early corruption has crept in, which is common to both the VH group and the TU group. Here L sometimes shows a reading superior to that of either group.

An example is the line referred to above, p. 368:

For Mede is moylere of Amendes engendred.

We saw that in TU and their fellows, Amendes had been corrupted to a senseless 'frendis.' In VH the passage had been altered, evidently because the scribe had in his original some reading which he could not understand. L however retains the right reading 'of Mendes engendred.'

Again, in IV, 141, where both the VH and the TU group go wrong over the name of Warren Wisdom, L has it correctly:

Waryn Wisdom þo ny Witty his fere[1].

[1] In II, 87 I and Dig also have the right reading, whilst W and As are wanting. In IV, 141, I, Dig and W also have the right reading. But, almost certainly in the case of Dig and W, and possibly in the case of I, this is a correction due to the influence of the B-text.

L then is a garbled copy of a good MS., independent of both the other groups. It is a pity that this type of MS. should be represented only by this garbled copy, just as it would have been a pity had it been represented only by a MS. of which the rats had gnawed every page. But neither of these mishaps would entirely vitiate the MS. For we have such good evidence from VHTU, that we can put our fingers with certainty upon the lines of L which are garbled. Of other passages we can say with equal certainty 'Here the scribe is following his copy accurately: and the fact that he agrees with TU against VH (or the contrary) is a strong argument that it is VH and not TU which has here wandered away from the original.' The very ignorance of the scribe who corrupted the L version, is, in fact, in his favour. Had he been a man who knew the poem in some other version, and who corrected his copy from his knowledge of that version, he would have produced a text much more accurate than that now preserved at Lincoln's Inn; but one for our purpose comparatively worthless. On the contrary, however, L's tradition seems to be a peculiarly uncontaminated one; and his corruptions are his own. Hence his worth; much as in certain cases an ignorant and illiterate witness may give evidence, the value of which is enhanced by his ignorance[1].

In the Ingilby MS. [I] (see Skeat, *Parallel Extracts*, 28—31) we have another MS. which is related only distantly to either the VH or the TU groups: of the two it stands nearer to TU. I's independence becomes manifest if we compare its behaviour in the places where V and H, or T and U, go wrong together.

Of the sixty-three places where V and H agree in what seemed to be a departure from the true reading as preserved in T or U, I agrees with T or U in fifty. In six cases I is corrupt or missing. In seven, however, I agrees with VH. But, on scrutinizing these seven, we find that four of them are cases where, on weighing all the MS. evidence, it is quite possible that the agreement of VH and I is due, after all, to their reading being the original one; and that the better alliteration given, for example, by U, is due to a scribe's attempt at improving his original. In two other cases the reading of VH and I, though indis-

[1] The corruptions of the garbler are in themselves interesting. He had a good alliterative vocabulary, and rejoiced in good old words like *weoued*, altar. He probably wrote in the late 14th or very early 15th century: for he has altered 'That heore Parisch haþ ben pore seþþe the Pestilence tyme' P. 81, to 'þat sen þe furste pestilence heore parysch weore' [pore *illegible*]. This alteration would be natural if made by a contemporary not long after the last pestilence. It would hardly have been made late in the 15th century, when the distinction between the different pestilences must have been largely obliterated in popular memory.

putably a departure from the original text, might well have been made independently. Only in one instance out of the sixty-three does I accompany VH in what is pretty clearly an error, and yet one not very likely to have been made independently. That there should be only one such instance in eight passus, is strong evidence that I belongs to a type quite distinct from the VH group.

As to any possible relation between I and the TU group: we have seen that of the twenty-two passages where T and U seem to go astray together, six are possibly not errors after all. Of these twenty-two passages, I goes with TU in eleven; including the six doubtful cases, which ought to be dismissed as inconclusive. The five remaining cases are not very conclusive either; but they serve to suggest the possibility of some slight connection between I and the TU group.

The Ingilby MS. then, is not connected with the VH group: it may be very slightly connected with the TU group. It is a much less corrupt MS. than is the one at Lincoln's Inn; but for our purpose it is much less useful. For there are some signs that it has passed through the hands of a scribe or of a corrector who knew the text in the C-version: hence, when I corrects VH or TU, we cannot be certain, without careful scrutiny, that we have a genuine unpolluted tradition. But the traces of B or C influence upon I are, after all, very small; so that the evidence of I is still of great value, though we must receive it with caution.

Two other MS. need mention. Ashmole 1468 [As] combines all possible faults. It is imperfect, corrupt, and contaminated by B or C-influence. Harleian 3954 [H_3] is, up to Passus v, not an A MS. at all, but a B-type. From Passus v onwards it is a contaminated A-MS. As however most of our examples have been drawn from the earlier passus, it seemed best not to quote H_3.

The Ilchester MS., though mainly a C-text, contains a passage derived from an A-MS., apparently of the TU type.

Many of the above suggestions are put forth only tentatively; for we have not yet had time to sift thoroughly our transcripts and collations. The following statements, however, are advanced with some confidence:

1. That a nearer approximation to the original A-text can be drawn from the MSS. of the TU group than from the Vernon MS.

2. That any text which is to reproduce closely the original poem, must be founded both upon the TU group and also, although to a less

degree, upon the VH group; the MSS. which belong to neither tradition must be used to turn the scale in doubtful cases; whilst the danger of introducing readings which may themselves be the result of correction from a B- or C-text, must be borne in mind.

3. That a text so formed will be found to approximate much more closely to the received B-text than the received A-text does.

4. That only when we know what is the 'diction, metre and sentence structure' of the original A-text, can we argue with certainty whether these are, or are not, materially different from those of the B-additions, or decide whether B's treatment of the A-text is really inconsistent with unity of authorship.

It is impossible to do any work at the text of *Piers Plowman* without troubling a large number of persons: and thanks are more particularly due to Sir Henry Ingilby for the long loan of his MS.: to Professor R. A. Williams for a preliminary inspection of the Dublin MS., and to the authorities of Trinity College, Dublin, for a three months loan of that MS.: to the Earl of Ilchester for kindly placing his MS. at the British Museum: to the Duke of Westminster for allowing us to consult his MS. at Eaton Hall: and to the librarians, of the British Museum, of the Bodleian, of Trinity College Cambridge, and of Lincoln's Inn for their unfailing courtesy and consideration. It goes without saying that every student of *Piers Plowman* is under heavy obligations to Prof. Skeat, upon whose work all later research must be based: we have also to thank him personally for the interest he has taken in our work.

The writers hope, later in the year, to print either MS. T or R, with collations of all the other MSS. Meantime, in illustration of what has been said above, Passus v, 43—106 is given from T, with collations from R(awlinson), U(niv. Coll., Oxford), E (Trin. Coll., Dub.), H_2 (Harl. 6041), D(ouce), Dg (Digby), W (The Duke of Westminster's MS.), L(incoln's Inn MS.), I (Sir Henry Ingilby's MS.), A(shmole), V(ernon), H(arl. 875). As the sole object is to illustrate the relationship of the MSS., mere orthographic variations are omitted.

PIERS PLOWMAN.

Passus v, 43—106.

Þanne repentaunce reherside his teme
And made wil to wepe watir wiþ his eiȝen
Pernel proud herte plat hire to þe erþe
And lay longe er heo lokide vp & lord mercy criede
And behiȝte to hym þat vs alle made
Heo shulde vnsewe hire serke & sette þere an heire
For to affaiten hire flessh þat fers was to synne
Shal neuere heiȝ herte me hente but holde me lowe
And suffre to be misseid & so dide I neuere
But now wile I meke me & mercy beseke
Of alle þat I haue had enuye in myn herte
Lecchour seide allas & to oure lady criede
To make mercy for his mysdede betwyn god & hym
With þat he þe satirday seue ȝer þer aftir
Shulde drinke but wiþ þe doke & dyne but ones
Enuye wiþ heuy herte askide aftir shrift

43. *Þanne*] And þan W; Þan ran EDgLIAVH. *reherside*] & rehersyd DgLIAVH; to recherce W. *his*] þis V. 44. *made*] gart A; *omitted* D. *wil*] wylki*am* H_2; William VH. *to wepe*] wepen W. *wiþ*] of E; riht at bothe I; w*i*th boþe AV. *eiȝen*] eye R; *here a hole in* H. 45. *proudherte*] þe proud A. *plat hire*] fel plat W; plat doun A. *þe erþe*] grounde AVH. 46. *vp*] *om.* RUDDgLIAVH. *lord mercy*] mercy sho E; lord merci heo H_2; oure lord mercy L; mercy A; to vr ladi V. *criede*] gan crie A. *And lay—criede*] She sighed soryfu & saide lord mercy W.

47. I *omits this line.* *behiȝte*] sho hight E; hight W. *made*] maked with his myght L. 48. *Heo*] Yat sho EA; he L. *shulde*] wolde LAVH. *serke*] schorte L; shert H; smok DgV. *þere*] *yer*in EA; on *added, later hand* H_2. 49. *For to*] To RUWA. *affaiten*] afauten R; ffete EVH; afeyntyn A; dawntyn I. *fers*] fresch RULH; frele AV. 50. *heiȝ*] liht VH. *hente*] hende U; hente quoþ heo H; haunte D; hold A. *heiȝ—hente*] my hert be so heigh W. *holde me*] e*u*er holdyn it A. 52. *But*] And IV; *omitted* H. *wil I*] I wil RI; wil *omitted* A; I con wel V. *me*] myself H. 53. *alle*] *om.* L; alle ying I. *haue*] *om.* D. *enuye*] of enuye RA; *pr*ide WI. 54. *Lecchour*] Lechery DgW; þe lechoure L; þe lechours H. *seide*] yo seyd I. *to*] on RUEDDgWLI. *to—lady*] lord mercy H. *criede*] gradde L; bad H. 55. *mercy*] amendes U. *To—mercy*] *om.* H. *for*] of L. *misdede*] misdedis IH; sowle A. *him*] hys soaulle EDgL; hym of mysdede A; hym silue*n* H. I *omits* betwyn hym *and inserts* mene *after* mercy, *above the line.* *In* W *the line reads*: To gete mercy of god in helpe of his soule. V *expands into two lines*: To maken him han Merci for his misdede, Bitwene god almihti and his pore soule.

After l. 55 H_2 *inserts four ll.*: And chastite to seke as a chyld clene, The lust of his likam to leten for eu*e*re, And fle fro felyschipe there foly may arise, For that makith many man mysdo ful ofte. 57. *With*] and A. *he*] he schulde RUEDgWLIAVH. *þe satirday*] saterday W; satourdayes RU; *om.* I. ȝer] ȝere sykerly I. *þer*] *om.* REDAV. *Shulde*] *om.* RUEDDgWLIAVH. *but*] *om.* EH_2DgWA. *doke*] doge L; goos RU. *dyne*] eten VH. 59. *heuy*] hiȝe H.

And carfulliche his cope begynneþ he to shewe
He was as pale as a palet & on þe palesie he semide
He was cloþid in a caury maury I can it nouȝt descryue
A kertil & a courtepy a knyf be his side
Of a Freris frokke were þe fore sleuys
As a lek þat hadde leyn longe in þe sonne
So lokide he wiþ lene chekis lourande foule
His body was bolnid for wroþ þat he bot his lippe
And wroþliche he wroþ his fest to wreke hym he þouȝte
Wiþ werkis & wordis whanne he saiȝ his tyme
Venym & verious or vynegre I trowe
Walewiþ in my wombe & waxiþ as I wene
I miȝte not many day do as a man miȝte
Such wynd in my wombe wexiþ er I dyne

60. *And*] *om.* W. *carfulliche*] gretliche V. *cope*] coupe UED; culpe Dg; coulpe W; compte R; counte A; gult LI; gultus VH. *begynneþ he*] he gynnyþ RU; biginneþ DVH; begynnyth for I; he couettes E; com for A. 61. *He was*] *om.* WVH. *as pale*] pale RDg; *om.* E. *a palet*] a pelet R_2DgLA; a pelat U; a piller E; erthe I. *He—palet*] þe pelour was pelled H. *and*] *om.* DLAVH. *on*] in EDgWLIAVH. þe] a DgWV; *om.* DI. *palesie*] perlesy E. *on þe palesie*] paltyk R; palatik U. *semide*] semeth L. 62. *was*] E *omits*. *He was*] *om.* H; and L. *a*] *om.* H. *I can*] I coude RUEDgWIAVH; coude y L. *it*] *om.* EA; hym UVH. *it nouȝt*] not it D. *descryue*] discrie RUELA; deserue Dg; deuise W.

63, 64. *Wanting in* V. 63. *knyf*] kneuet A. 64. *Of*] As A. *freres*] frere DLI. *frokke*] frog RA; frogge U; freyke I. þe] hys ELDgWAH. *fore*] forne DgI; forme UA; two H. 65. *As—þat*] Like as he H. þat] *om.* W. þat—þe] longe leyen in the hote L. 66. *he*] E *omits*. *lene*] his lene H. *lourande*] lowrynge RUDDgWLIAH; lourede he V. *foule*] full foull EDg; ful lowe H. 67. *bolnid*] bolled VH. *His—bolnid*] Al forbolne W. *for*] *with* DgA. *wroþ*] angre W. *þat he bot*] bote he on A; he bot V; he bot boþe H. *lippe*] lippes EDgWLIAVH.

68, 69. *One line in* A: He lokyd vndur his browis as a bond dogge. *And*] *om.* VH. *he*] *om.* E. *wroþ*] wrong REDgLVH; wroþ *corr. later hand to* wrong W. *fest*] handes E. *hym*] hem DgW. *he*] *om.* D. *to—þouȝte*] he þouȝte hi*m* awreke V; he þouȝte hym to wreke H. 69. *werkis & wordis*] werke*s* and wit*h* word*es* R; werk or wiþ word UE; werkes or wordes DL; werk & woord W; work*es* or wit*h* word*es* DgVH. *whanne*] than H_2. *saiȝ*] sey RUDI; say H_2; seeȝ Dg; seiȝ V; sawe ELH.

After l. 69 W *inserts seven* B *lines* (87—93; *not* 84—93 *cf. Skeat, Par. Extracts, p.* 26). 70. *&*] or RUEDAVH; than Dg; *om.* I. *verious*] vergeous UD; Vernish DgWV; *ver*nycchith I; *ver*degrese H. *Venym—vynegre*] Wormes (*or* Wernies—*first two letters over erasure*) or wynagre or wenom E; Wyrmys or vermyn or vinegre or wyriuis A. *Instead of this line* L *reads*: Of leosardes or of lobbes venym hath me laghte. 71. *Walewiþ*] And walweth L; walles EVH; waldeþ W; Walkyn A. *wombe*] wombe quoþ he H. *&*] or VH. *as*] *om.* RDVH. *wene*] trowe W. *waxiþ—wene*] worcheth me wrathe L.

71, 72, 73 *form one line in* A: Walkyn in my wombe, werkyn or I dyne. 72. *I miȝte*] Myght I W; I ne mihte V; þat I myghte L. *many*] many a RDgH. *many—don*] leve mony ȝeres E. *a man miȝte*]; a man suld EW; a man owghte DgLVH. 73. *wynd*] a wynde W. *wexiþ*] waxed D. *dyne*] dye V. *er I dyne*] alway W.

I haue a neiȝebo*ur* neiȝ me I haue noiȝed hym ofte
And blamide hym behynde his bak to bringe hym in fame
To apeire hym be my power I p*ur*suide wel ofte
And belowen hym to lordis to don hym lese silu*er*
And don hise frendis ben hise fon þoruȝ my false tunge
His g*rac*e & hise gode happis greuide me wel sore
Betwyn hym & his meyne I haue mad wraþþe
Boþe his lyme & his lif was lost þoruȝ my tunge
Whanne I mette hym in a market þ*at* I most hatide
I hailside hym as hendely as I his frend were
He is douȝtiere þanne I I dar non harm don hym
Ac hadde I maistrie & miȝt I wolde m*ur*dre hym for eu*er*e
Whanne I come to þe chirche & knelide to þe rode
To p*rey*e for þe peple as þe prest techiþ

74. *a neiȝebour*] a nextbur E; neȝeboris H. *neiȝ me*] nere me EDg; by me W; me neih V; many H. *I haue noiȝed*] I noyed RE; Yat I haue noyȝed I; hath noyd A. *hym*] hem WH; me A; *om.* I. *ofte*] wel ofte RU; full ofte E. 75. *And blamide*] I blamed E; Ablamed V. *hym—his*] hem—here H. *his bak*] W *omits. to bringe*] to putte W; & brouht I. *hym*] hem HW. *in fame*] to defame L; in defaut WH; in disclaundre V.

A *omits ll.* 75 *and* 76; H *puts them after l.* 77. 76. *To apeire*] To pare EW; And peired V. *hym*] *om.* W; hem H. *be*] with UI; in E. *I pursuide*] I p*er*sewed hym E, hem W; I haue p*ur*sued L; y p*re*ued (*error for* p*er*[s]ued ?) H; I-punissched hi*m* V. *wel ofte*] ful ofte DVH; ofte UEIW; feole sithes L. 77. *And*] and als E; and eke DgLH; *om.* WV; I haue A. *belowen*] yley on U; misloued E; apayryd I; ybulled H. *hym*] *om.* A; hem H. *lordis*] þe lord H. *don*] gar E; make VH. *hym*] hem H. *hym lese*] losse hys E. 78. *And*] To E; Tho A; *om.* WV; I H. *don*] gar E; mad L; I-don V; made H. *hise—hise*] here—here H. *ben*] to ben R. *þoruȝ wit*h DAVH. *my*] his U. *tunge*] wordes L; talys EA.

79, 80. *Misplaced after l.* 83 *in* I. 79, 80, 81. *Misplaced after l.* 85 D; *omitted* LH. 81. *Omitted* I.

79. *gode happis*] godnes EA. *happis*] happ DgWV. *greuide*] greuyth AV; greuen WI. *wel*] *om.* UIA; full EDWV. *sore*] ofte A. 80. *hym—meyne*] man & his meyne I; men & here mene A; him & his wyf W; men & yair wyffes E. *I haue*] *om.* R; haue I W. *mad wraþþe*] wratthe made ofte R; mad ofte wratthe U; made striffe ofte E; maked wreche A. 81. *his—lif*] lymme & life DgW; lyme & lith E; lyfe & leme A; his lyf and his leome V. *tunge*] wikkyd tonge A. 82. *Whanne*] And whan W; but when H. *mette*] mete I. *hym*] *om.* DW. *a*] *om.* RUDDgWLI; þe EAVH. *most*] so muche L. *hatide*] hate IVW. 83. *hailside*] heylid AV; hals W. *hym*] *om.* W. *as hendely*] so hendeliche L; hendely I; als frendly EWA. *Here* H *has a hole* (*roughly an inch in diameter*), *which breaks into four lines. as I*] so I L. *as—frend*] his frend as I V. 84. *He is*] He was A; But he was H. *He—þanne I*] Bot he y*at* is doghtyer E. *douȝtiere þanne I*] *hole in* H. *I dar*] durste R; I durste H. *no*] do W. *don hym*] him done L. *non—hym*] bede hym none harm H. 85. *Ac*] But DgWLV; And E; *om.* A; ȝif H. *hadde I*] I hed E; y had had H. *maistrie*] þe maystrie W. *&*] or REDg; oþ*er* U. *& miȝt*] *om.* WI. *maistrie & miȝht*] *hole in* H. *wolde—hym*] wolde him mayme L; wold a dystroyed hym A; Morþerde hi*m* V; hadde maymed hym H. 86. *come*] came DgA. *-e to þe chir-*] *hole in* H. *&*] to WH. *knelide*] knele RUH$_2$WLIVH; suld knele E. *to*] before RAV; afore U. 87. *To*] I LIA; And scholde V. *preye*] preyd A. *techiþ*] me techys RU; vs techeþ V; prechiþ H.

Aftir þanne I crize on my knes þat crist gyue hym sorewe
þat bar a wey my bolle & my broken shete
Fro þe auter myn eize I turne & beholde
How heyne haþ a newe cote I wysshe it were myn howne
And of his lesinges I lauze þerof in myn herte
Ac of his wynnyng I wepe and weile þe tyme
I deme men þere þei don ille & zet I do wers
I wolde þat iche wizt were my knaue
And who so haþ more þanne I þat angriþ myn herte
þus I lyue loueles as a lyþer dogge
And al my brest bolniþ for bittir of my galle

Between ll. 87 *and* 88 *three MSS. insert a line:* For pilgrames for palmers for all ye peple eftir EW ; *for all*] & for A. 88. *Aftir þanne*] Aftir þat UW ; Than ELAVH ; After D ; & aftir I. *I crize*] crie I L ; I prey U ; bidde I H. *Aftir—knes*] On my knes þan I cryed A. *on*] vppon V. *on my knes*] on mekely Dg ; as oof W ; wiþ my mouþ H. *I—knes*] knelyd I vpon my kneys & praed E. *þat*] *om.* RUE. *crist*] god WA ; oure lady RU. *hym*] hem RWLAVH ; yaim E. 89. *bar*] haþ I-bore V. *bolle*] blake bolle H_2 ; bolles L. *broken*] brode RUV. *shete*] schetes L. A *reads:* That brokyn my bolle & borne awey my schete.

90. L *omits this line.* *Fro*] Than fro W ; And also from E ; Also to forne A. *myn—turne*] y turne myn eize UV ; myn eyen down than I turne Dg ; I turne me H ; my ene I turned E ; zit myne eyne I turnyd A ; I myn eien cast W. *& beholde*] *begins next line in* EDgWLA ; And beholdith Dg ; and byholde heyne H ; and byhelde REA.

91, 92. *Here are two lines in all MSS. but* TH_2D. *howne*] *om.* D. 91. *heyne*] Hyk Dg ; hoge I ; haue W ; he H ; mony E. *haþ*] hed EA. *a newe cote*] new cotez E. *How—howne*] And—cote DgEWA ; y byholde byholde byhynde me on a neowe kote haue L ; How—cote & his wyf anoyer IVH. 92. RU *have:* and al þe wele þat he haþ greueþ me wel sore. *In the eight remaining MSS. the following line, with slight variations, occurs:* Than I wische it war myn and al the webbe after DgIV. *Than*] Anon W. *I wische*] wische y HL ; I wissyd yat E ; I wyschid A. *it*] yai E. *and*] with E. *webbe*] webbez E ; his wele H. 93. *And of*] Of RUDgWLIAVH ; At E ; And alwey after D. *his*] *om.* H_2 ; yair E. *lauze*] smyle RU. *þerof in*] and þerof lauzeth RU ; & light was E ; it liketh DgIH ; hit lightenes LW ; a lytil in A ; hit likeþ me in V. *myn*] *om.* E. 94. *Ac*] And RH ; *om.* EA ; But DgWL. *of his*] For yair E ; for his WIVH. *wepe*] wepyd EA. *weile*] weylid A ; werys E. *tyme*] while LA. 95. *men*] *om.* W. *þere þei*] þere y U ; þey LH ; þat he W ; þat VIDg. *ille*] euyll EDLH. *I do*] do y L. *wers*] wel worse VE. EA *have two lines here:* And I deme in my hert at mony doys euyll, And zit I do me wel wers I do me on my seluen E ; I deme men in myne hert yat yai don ille, But zit I do werse be dom of my selfe A.

96. DW *omit.* *I*] For I EVH. *þat*] *om.* L. *iche*] euerilke E ; alle H. *wizt*] wyze L ; a wythe A ; a wiht V ; wiztes H. *wolde—wizt*] couet yat euryman I. *were*] wer becomon EI ; *in* þis world were V ; in world were H. *knaue*] knaues H. L *reads:* weore my knaue in þis world wonyng. 97. *And who so*] And whas þat L ; And qwo yat I ; Who þat W. *haþ*] haue A. *þat*] he L ; it WAH ; gretly E. *angriþ*] greuyth A. 98. *þus*] Bot yus E ; And þus WA. *loueles*] lawles E. *as*] lyk RUEDDgWLIAVH. *lyþer*] luþer V ; lethir EH ; leother L ; ledur A. 99. *And*] þat RUEDgLIVH ; Than W. *al*] *om.* I. *bolniþ*] Bolleþ VH. *my—bolniþ*] bolnyth my breste U. *bitter*] bitternes E.

Between ll. 99 *and* 100 W *inserts two B lines:* I might not ete many zere as a man sholde, For enuie & euel will is ill to defie.

May no sugre ne swet þing swage it an vnche
Ne no dyapendyon dryue it fro myn herte
ȝif þat shrift shulde it shop a gret wondire
ȝis redily quaþ repentaunce & redde hym to goode
Sorewe for synne sauiþ wel manye
I am sory quaþ enuye I am but selde oþere
And þat makiþ me so mad for I ne may me venge

100, 101. *The second halves of these lines have been transposed in* VH, *spoiling the metre; thus:* May—swete, dryue *&c.:* Ne no Diopendion aswagen *&c.* 100. *May*] *yer* may I; Ther is W. *ne*] ne no DA; no L. *ne—þing*] so swete WV. *swage*] may swage W; asswage DgIVH; swete R. *it*] me E. *an vnche*] on ynche E; vnneþe VH. 101. *dyapendyon*] diapendion REDgLI; dyapendron A; Diopendion V; diapenydion UW; dyapenidioun H_2; diapenydyon D. *dryue*] drawe A. 102. *ȝif þat*] And ȝif þat W; ȝif RDIVH; And if EDgA; And þanne ȝef any L. *shrift*] schrit V. *it*] me I. *shop*] schepe D; stoppe EH_2A; saue LI; þenne swopen out V; aswage H. *it shop*] *om.* RUW; aswage it H. *a—wondir*] hit were gret wonder REA; it were a gret wondir U; a gret wonder hit were V; nowe a wonder it were W; semed hit a gret wondur L; me thingith it were wondere I; wonder me þinkeþ H. 103. *ȝis*] A ȝis A. *redily*] rede I E. *redde*] rede H_2. *him*] hem W. *to goode*] to þe best H; ye best EA. 104. *Sorewe*] Oft sorwe W; And saide sorwe L. *for*] of her I; for his D; for heore VH. *synne*] synnes EDgIAV; synneþ H. *sauiþ*] saue D. *wel*] ofte wel L; full EH; men ful V; *om.* A. *manye*] many on A. 105. *I*] And I Dg. *am but*] am Dg; nam but WH; ne am but V. *selde*] seldom UEWA; selden Dg; seilden L; seldyn I; seldene V. *oþere*] *yer* E.

Between ll. 105 *and* 106 A *inserts*: Also wilde in hert & pensyue in hert & thouth. 106. *And*] *om.* U. *þat*] *om.* L. *so*] *om.* EW. *mad*] mate DgI. *for*] *om.* W; þat LA. *ne may me*] no may me L; may me not W; may not A. *venge*] avengyn I.

R. W. Chambers.
J. H. G. Grattan.

London.

MISCELLANEOUS NOTES.

The Sepulchres at Pola referred to by Dante.

In the ninth canto of the *Inferno* Dante compares the tombs in which the heretics are confined in the sixth circle of Hell to the sepulchres at Arles and Pola.

> Sì come ad Arli, ove Rodano stagna,
> Sì com' a Pola presso del Quarnaro,
> Che Italia chiude e suoi termini bagna,
> Fanno i sepolcri tutto il loco varo:
> Così facevan quivi d' ogni parte,
> Salvo che il modo v' era più amaro.
>
> *Inferno* ix, 112—117.

Dante, no doubt, heard of the sepulchres at Pola from pilgrims to the Holy Land, the 'Palmieri' of whom he speaks in the *Vita Nuova* (§ 41, ll. 35 ff.). These sepulchres, and the remains of the great Roman amphitheatre, were objects of interest many years after Dante's time to those who were on their way to the Holy Land. Pola, at the southern extremity of the Istrian Peninsula, was the first stage on the voyage to Jerusalem from Venice, the port of departure, from which it was a day's sail.

Several contemporary accounts of the pilgrimage to the Holy Land have been preserved, of which the best known are the *Viaggio al Monte Sinai*, in 1384, of Simone Sigoli of Florence; the *Saint Voyage de Jherusalem*, in 1395, of the Seigneur d'Anglure; and the *Viaggio in Terra Santa*, in 1431, of Ser Mariano of Siena.

Simone Sigoli does not mention Pola, as he and his party did not touch there. Apparently they met with contrary winds, for when they were four days out from Venice they had got no further than the mouth of the Gulf of Quarnero. Here they were caught in a violent storm, such as is often encountered off that gulf, which as Simone

remarks, well deserves its name of *Carnaro*[1], 'charnel-house' (as though from *Carnarium*).

Both the author of the *Saint Voyage de Jherusalem* and Ser Mariano give detailed accounts of Pola and of the objects of interest in the neighbourhood. The former, under the heading *Paula*, says:

'Le lundi matin nous partismes du port de Venise; sy arrivasmes a Paula, qui est a cent M. oultre Venise, le mardi ensuivant, le darrien jour d'aoust.

Paula est cité assés bonne; mais elle fut jadis meilleur, car elle fut destruicte pour le temps de la guerre des Genevois et des Veniciens[2]. Et dehors la cité, devers la terre, a une tresbelle fonteine d'eau doulce devant laquelle a ung tournoyement, par lequel appert bien qu'il fut jadis moult bel et fait de grant richesses et seignorie. Et le fist faire Rolant, si comme l'en dit, et encore l'appellent aujourd'uy le palaix Rolant[3]. Et dehors ledit palaix vers la marine, a moult grant quantité le monumens de pierre entaillée couvers, et sont sur terre: et y en peut bien avoir environ iiij^{c}; et dedens les aucuns voit l'en les os des chrestiens qui illec furent mis après une grande desconfiture que mescreans y firent. Plusieurs y a desdits monumens que l'en ne peut veoir dedans, car ilz sont trop couvers.'

(Ed. Bonnardot et Longnon, *S. A. T. F.*, 1878, pp. 6—7.)

Ser Mariano of Siena, who made the voyage thirty-six years later, left Venice on St Mark's day (April 25), and reached Pola the following day:

'A dì venticinque el dì di Santo Marco...in su la nona la Galea fece vela pigliando el camino verso Terra Santa...A dì XXVI, fumo in Istria nella città di Pola, nella quale trovammo uno edifizio quasi simile al Coliseo di Roma, e molti altri nobili edifizii. Anco vi trovammo sì grande quantità di sepulcri tutti d' uno pezzo ritratti come

[1] This is doubtless the *Carrenare* mentioned by Chaucer in the *Book of the Duchess*. In a note upon the passage in his edition of Chaucer's *Treatise on the Astrolabe*, Brae quotes the following from a Paduan writer, Palladio Negro, in illustration of the proverbial dangers of those waters: 'E regione Istriae, sinu Polatico, quem nautae *carnarium* vocitant.' He gives a still more striking passage from Vergier, Bishop of Capo d' Istria, which is quoted by Sebastian Munster in his *Cosmographie*: 'Par deça le gouffre enragé lequel on appelle vulgairement *Carnarie* d'autantque le plus souvent on le voit agité de tempestes horribles; et là s'engloutissent beaucoup de navires et se perdent plusieurs hommes.' Brae compares the name *Shambles* applied to a dangerous shoal off the Bill of Portland by English sailors.

[2] The Genoese had destroyed the Venetian fleet at Pola, and captured the town sixteen years before (1379).

[3] This is the Roman amphitheatre, which as late as the end of the seventeenth century still bore the name of 'Orlandino,' according to Spon, the antiquary, who visited Pola in 1675, and described the remains in his *Voyages d'Italie, de Dalmatie, de Grèce et du Levant* (Lyon, 1677).

arche, che sarebbe incredibile a dire el numero d' essi con molte ossa dentro. Sono da Venegia a qui centovinti miglia. Stemmo due dì.'
(Ed. Moreni, Firenze, 1822, pp. 6—7.)

The great Roman amphitheatre at Pola stands to this day, but nothing is now to be seen of the numerous sepulchres referred to by Dante and later writers. In his work on *Dalmatia, the Quarnero and Istria*, published in 1887, T. G. Jackson, after mentioning the tradition that Dante once sojourned within the walls of the Convent of San Michele in Monte at Pola, writes as follows:

'Between the convent and the town is supposed to have been the ancient cemetery, to which Dante likens the rows of arks or sarcophagi in which at a white heat the heresiarchs expiate their theological difficulties:

Sì come ad Arli, ove Rodano stagna, &c.

At Arles twenty years ago one could still walk between avenues of sarcophagi as in the days of Dante.... At Pola all traces of the cemetery have disappeared; but Signor Rizzi (the conservator of ancient monuments at Pola) tells me that fragments of ancient tombs with Pagan inscriptions abound in the rough walls that divide the fields of the neighbourhood.' (Vol. III, p. 300.)

Paget Toynbee.

Burnham, Bucks.

A Forgotten English Translation of Barclay's 'Argenis.'

Not long ago I was attracted by the mention, I think in a book-seller's catalogue which I have unfortunately mislaid, of what appeared to be an English translation of the *Argenis* by John Jacob, published at Dublin in 1734. Such a version was quite unknown to me and seemed generally to have escaped the notice of students of Barclay. No reference is made to it under Barclay's life in the *D.N.B.* nor is it included in the long list of translations given in the second chapter of K. F. Schmid's *John Barclays Argenis* (Berlin and Leipzig, 1904)[1]. It is not to be found in the British Museum, and, as I am informed, it is not in the library of Trinity College, Dublin. At the suggestion of

[1] Mr Schmid's useful monograph requires to be corrected and supplemented in several particulars. For example he is sceptical on p. 139 as to the existence of the 1643 (Rouen) edition of de Mouchemberg's continuation of the *Argenis* mentioned by Mr Albert Collignon (p. 179 of the latter's *Notes sur L'Argenis de Jean Barclay*, Paris and Nancy, 1902). I can vouch for this being no ghost-book as I have a copy in my own collection.

Mr Alfred de Burgh I applied for information to that authority on Irish bibliography, Mr E. R. M°C. Dix, who most courteously lent me a copy of the book in his own possession. This has enabled me to give the following account.

The title runs: The | Adventures | Of | Poliarchus | And | Argenis. | *Translated from the Latin of* John | Barclay. | *By the Revd. Mr.* John Jacob. | Dublin: | Printed by James Hoey, at the Sign of *Mercury* | in *Skinner-Row*, opposite to the Tholsel, 1734.

The collation is Title 1 p., 1 p. blank, Dedication ('To Her Grace, the Dutchess of Dorset') 3 pp., 1 p. blank, preface pp. i—xiii, 1 p. blank, pp. 1—274. The recipient of the dedication was apparently chosen as being the wife of the Lord Lieutenant.

On p. i of the preface the reader is informed that 'the Original of this Translation was written by the learn'd *John Barclay*, on purpose, (as most suppose,) to amuse King *Henry* the IIId. of *France*, a Prince unfit for the Reins of Government, into his Duty under a diverting Relation of the Adventures of two chaste and constant Lovers.' The translator has plainly troubled himself but little about the chronology of his author's life. Barclay was seven years old at the time of Henry the third's assassination! We are told that James I 'not only settled a yearly Pension of some Thousands of Crowns on him, but also made him one of his Privy Council; Honours, which enroll him among the great Heroes of the learn'd World.' On the same page Virgil and Homer, who 'have only one principal Design in their poems' are contrasted with 'the soaring genius of Barclay.' As regards the details of the story Mr Jacob is anxious that his readers' faith should not be too severely strained. One thing he apprehends 'may perhaps be thought on first sight to exceed the bounds of what Criticks call the Marvelous' and that is—the mention of artificial ice. But having heard that the 'Virtuoso's of *France*' have produced artificial snow 'for the Entertainment of *Louis* XIV' he is 'humbly of Opinion it may be as possible to make artificial Ice too.' Jacob is aware that the *Argenis* has been translated already. 'Before I undertook this Performance, I found there was extant an old *English* literal Translation of *Barclay* of almost an Hundred Years standing' (it would seem, if this is to be taken literally, that the second edition of Kingsmill Long (1636) had come under the translator's eye). 'The original,' he continues, 'is pursu'd in so close and servile a Manner by the Translator, that, as Mr *Dryden* says of *Holiday's* Version of *Juvenal*, he loses the Spirit of the Author when he thinks to take his Body....His *English* besides is...obsolete

and his Translation in many places false' (Long's accuracy can certainly be impugned).

But it is not merely the style of his previous translator but much of the substance of Barclay's book that the Rev. John Jacob feels would be distasteful to the audience whom he has in view. 'I question,' he writes, 'whether the best Hand in being could Translate *Barclay* verbally into *English*, so as to satisfy meer *English* Readers,' the reason being that 'Allusions to antient Poets as well as to the Customs of the Heathen World, tho' they are beautiful to the highest Degree in the Original *Latin*, yet would make an uncouth Figure in *English*.'

Mr Jacob certainly had the courage of his literary convictions. He laid violent hands on *Argenis*, retrenched the 'Allusions to antient Poets,' under which he seems to have included Barclay's own verses which are so freely interspersed in the original, and, in order to bring the tone still more into harmony with his readers' taste, Christianized the characters, changing the time of action from the days before the world had owned the rule of Rome to 'about the Declension of the fourth Century.' Thus when Poliarchus disguised as a girl displays unexpected heroism in defence of the king and his daughter, he is mistaken, not for the goddess Minerva, but for an angel.

It need hardly be said that the long discussions that break Barclay's narrative receive little mercy from Mr Jacob, although on the night before the attack on Argenis and himself Meleander edifies the company by relating a conference he has had with an Epicurean Atheist.

The style is such as might be expected. We read 'how king Poliarchus when in the Capacity of a private Man in Sicily had fall'n a Victim to the Princess' exact Harmony of Features, and her many endearing Charms of Virtue,' and, when all obstacles to the lovers' union have been finally overcome, 'Description can give but a faint Image of their Happiness: Sweet Blessings, soft Transports, and Downy Exstasys attended their Lives from the Hour of their Marriage.'

Though the performance here described is scarcely a translation in the stricter sense, but only an English rendering of the bare story of Barclay's book, yet it undoubtedly possesses a certain interest. It must have a place in the literary history of *Argenis*, as an attempt to offer this romance in an English dress, coming between the versions of Kingsmill Long (1625 and 1636) and Le Grys (1629) on the one hand, and Clara Reeve's *The Phoenix; or the History of Polyarchus and Argenis* (1772) on the other. The tastelessness of the adaptation fairly

illustrates the attitude of the day towards the literature of this earlier period.

More than a century before Jacob, indeed only three years after the appearance of the original, Bishop Coeffeteau had produced a French abridgement of the *Argenis*. This differs in detail from the present work.

EDWARD BENSLY.

ABERYSTWYTH.

NATHANIEL FIELD AND JOSEPH TAYLOR.

The dating of the plays in the collection ascribed to Beaumont and Fletcher depends to some extent on the succession of actors in the King's company. In particular, the actor-list attached to *The Laws of Candy* in the Folio of 1679 includes the name of Joseph Taylor, but not that either of Richard Burbage or of Nathaniel Field. It is therefore of interest to know when Taylor joined and Field left the company. Burbage and Field are in the license of March 27, 1619 (Hazlitt, *English Drama and Stage*, 50), but Burbage had died on the previous March 13, presumably while the document was in preparation. On the following May 20, Lord Chamberlain Pembroke wrote to Lord Hay of a play 'which I being tender-hearted could not endure to see so soone after the loss of my old acquaintance Burbadg' (*Athenaeum*, 1882, I, 103). It is known from the actor-list of Webster's *Duchess of Malfy* (1623) that Taylor succeeded to Burbage's part of Ferdinand, and Mr Fleay conjectures (*Biographical Chronicle*, I, 173) that Field 'was disappointed at Taylor's being imported as Burbage's successor, and retired disgusted' in 1619. Conjectures are all the better when there is some evidence to support them, and it is therefore worth while to call attention to two documents calendared amongst Lord De La Warr's manuscripts (*Hist. MSS.* IV, 299) and doubtless belonging to the papers of Sir Lionel Cranfield, afterwards Earl of Middlesex, the Master of the Wardrobe. They are warrants by the Lord Chamberlain for the allowances due to the players for liveries, and are dated May 19, 1619 and April 7, 1621. In the 1619 warrant the names are the same as those in the license of that year, with the exception that Joseph Taylor replaces Richard Burbage. But by 1621 there is a further change in the substitution for Nathan Field of John Rice. Field, therefore, had left the company between May, 1619 and April, 1621. It is probable

that he had left it by August, 1619, since his successor, John Rice, was amongst the players in *Sir John van Olden Barnevelt* (Bullen, *Old Plays*, II, 201), which is known to have been produced in that month (*Athenaeum*, Jan. 19, 1884). It is true that he only played a Captain, and that all the players were not necessarily full members of the company, but, as he was already a member of the Lady Elizabeth's men in 1611 (Greg, *Henslowe Papers*, 18, 111), it is not particularly likely that he joined the King's men in any other capacity. Whether Field's retirement was due to disgust at the introduction of Taylor, I cannot say.

E. K. Chambers.

London.

English 'Mullion,' French 'Meneau.'

The *N.E.D.* regards *monial, mullion, munnion* as of identical origin, all from the O.F. forms of *meneau*, of unknown origin. Scheler, s.v. *meneau*, conjectured derivation from O.F. '**meienel*, dér. de *medianus*...l'anglais a *mullion, munnion* = *meneau*; ils me font l'effet d'être gâtés de *moielon, moienon*.' This conjecture is quite right, as is shown by the O.F. variants *moynel, moinel, monial, meigneaul, mayneau, méneau*, etc. (v. *N.E.D.*, s.v. *monial*, and Godef. s.v. *manel*). The form *moynel* occurs in E. 14th—16th cent. (*N.E.D.*) and is obviously a derivative of *moyen* (de fenestre), the 'crosse-barre of a window' (Cotgrave). Both *moyen* and *moyenne* are common in O.F. in the sense of 'middle' (v. Godef.). Cf. *moyenner*, 'partager en deux,' and It. *tramezzo*, G. *Mittelpfosten, Mittelstück*, 'mullion.' The Mod. F. *meneau* represents O.F. *meienel*, the diphthong in the protonic syllable being reduced as in *menotte* (to *main*); cf. O.F. (cor) *meienel*, cor de moyenne grandeur (Godef. s.v. *moienel*). *Mullion* and *munnion* are, I think, of cognate, but not identical, origin. The *N.E.D.* regards *mullion* as probably a metathetic form of *munial*, and *munnion* as a corruption of *mullion*. The old derivation (Wedgwood, Century, Skeat), from *mognon*, 'stump,' is clearly wrong, while the dialect word *muntin, munton*, etc., given by the *Century Dictionary* under *munnion*, is obviously F. *montant* (v. *N.E.D.*, s.v. *muntin*). *Mullion* (1567, *N.E.D.*) is, I suggest, O.F. *moilon* (var. *moillon, meilon, molon, moulon, melon, moion*), milieu, centre (Godef.), which is a derivative of *medius*. It occurs as an architectural term, though not in the precise sense required, e.g. 'Ou *moilon* desdis fouyer

ou combe' (Godef. 1403). It has probably been confused with *moellon*, 'ashlar,' 'facing stone,' O.F. *moulon*, *moilon*, *moillon*, *moiron* (Godef. Comp.), as in the second example in the *N.E.D.*, s.v. *mullion*, 'Item for mending the *mullenis* in the sylling, 16*d.*' (Compt Buik of David Wedderburne, 1590, S.H.S.). This is the smallest item in a long account (pp. 63—4), while the repairing of *mullions* would be rather skilled work. *Munnion* (1593, *N.E.D.*) is probably either, as Scheler suggests, **moienon* (cf. *moyen* in Cotgrave), or *moyennant* from *moyenner*, to halve; cf. *montant*. It may, however, be a by-form of *mullion* due to the influence of *munton* (v.s.), which is used in a very similar sense. The correct equations are, I suggest, *meneau*, *monial* = **medianale*, *mullion* = **medilionem*, *munnion* = **medianonem*.

E. Weekley.

Nottingham.

REVIEWS.

Dante e la Francia dall' età media al Secolo di Voltaire. Da ARTURO FARINELLI. Milan: Hoepli, 1908. 2 vols. 8vo. xxvi + 560 and xiv + 381 pp.

Signor Farinelli, who agrees with Baretti that for three centuries Dante was no better known in France than Confucius, has undertaken and has executed with great skill a task of considerable difficulty, the erection of an imposing edifice with very scanty materials. His erudition is as great as his industry is untiring. He has apparently not only examined the whole of French literature, but has also read most of what has been written about it in the determination to allow no trace of the direct or indirect knowledge of Dante in France or of his influence on French poetry and thought to escape notice.

When the reader opens the book the number of proper names, the wealth of references and quotations may remind him of the avalanche of slips described by M. Anatole France as descending upon and overwhelming the too diligent student. But he need not fear this fate for our author, who bears all the weight of his learning lightly. His dithyrambic appreciations of 'il sommo,' his often acute and invariably interesting criticism of French authors, from Jean de Meun to Voltaire, his speculations as to how far they would have been capable of appreciating and understanding the great poet, whose name they often had never heard, are rarely wanting in vivacity and insight.

Signor Farinelli never yields to the temptation of exaggerating the fame and influence outside Italy of him whom he regards as the greatest as well as the most sublime of poets. The same determination to believe nothing for which there is not good evidence, makes him reject the stories of Dante's travels north of the Alps. He shows how little weight ought to be allowed to Villani's vague assertion that Dante visited Paris and many other parts of the world, and to the amplification of this statement by the fertile fancy of Boccaccio. Not only, according to him, did the poet never seek wisdom in her chosen abode, the Rue de Fouarre, but he never even trod the rough road between Lerici and Turbia or marvelled at the tombs which crowd the Elysian Fields of Arles where the Rhone first begins to linger.

Signor Farinelli shows that though the name of Dante is occasionally mentioned by French writers before Charles VIII crossed the Alps, there

is little to suggest that he was to them more than a name, except in the case of one popular author of the fourteenth century, Christine de Pisan, the daughter of the Italian astrologer and physician of Charles V, who was left a widow with a young family and an aged mother dependent on her, and who was probably the first woman to make her living by literature as a profession.

It is remarkable that the two French authors who before the end of the eighteenth century were the most appreciative students of the Divine Poet and whose works show the most abundant traces of his influence should both have been women—Christine de Pisan and Margaret d'Angoulême, Queen of Navarre. In the lives of both of these women, versed in all the learning and culture of their age, in the character and bent of their genius we may find the explanation of the attraction exercised on them by the great Tuscan. The loss of her husband overshadowed Christine's life, while Margaret of Anjou lavished the treasures of her devotion on an ungrateful husband and an unfeeling brother. The ardent and mystically expressed, the quintessential passion of Dante for his dead mistress must have touched a kindred cord in the hearts of these women, in both of whom moreover a strong tendency to religious mysticism was combined with much shrewd and even prosaic common sense.

Signor Farinelli fully explains why although the intercourse between France and Italy during the eighteenth century was close and continuous Dante still continued to be little more than a name to French authors. We are inclined to think that, if anything, he rather minimises the knowledge in France of the *Divine Comedy* during this period. The translation by Grangier was not published before 1596, but there must have been a public to buy the editions published at Lyons in the first half of the century. Yet he is doubtless right in refusing to accept two quotations by Montaigne as any proof that the author of the *Essays* had read the *Divine Comedy*. One, the simile of the Ants (*Purgatorio*, XXVI, 13), is to be found in the *Ercolano* of Varchi, a book known to Montaigne, the other 'che non men che saver, dubbiar m' aggrata' (*Inf.*, XI, 93) is a line which Montaigne is likely to have met elsewhere and which certainly would dwell in the memory of the sceptic.

It is remarkable that Aubigné, a poet, a theologian and an historian, should not have known Dante with whom his friend Duplessis Mornay was at least sufficiently acquainted for controversial purposes; but Signor Farinelli does not agree with those who hold that the Huguenot Satirist must have read the *Divine Comedy* because he sometimes is inspired by its very spirit: as when he says 'Que nous sommes vestus de splendeur éternelle' or speaks of 'l'éternelle soif de l'impossible mort' as the chief torment of the damned. Certainly the deep religious feeling which runs through the verse of the Protestant soldier, the fierce indignation, the pregnant and picturesque compression, not unfrequently remind us of the Florentine poet, but so kindred a genius had it borrowed at all would have borrowed more. If Aubigné had

known Dante we should find traces of his influence on every page of *Les Tragiques.*

It was, as our author points out, the hesitating appreciation and scarcely less emphatic denunciation of Dante by Voltaire which first spread the fame of the great Florentine in France. Boileau had formulated the final, immutable laws of art. Everything must approve itself to 'le Goût,' to that taste which was the outcome of the traditions of classical antiquity, of the Renaissance, of Cartesian rationalism and of the dislike of all that is complicated, heterogeneous and obscure, which is, or was, the characteristic of the French genius. Voltaire was a faithful follower of Boileau and had a profound contempt for the Middle Ages, their religion, their philosophy, their art, their social and political organisation. When all this is taken into consideration we are pleasantly surprised to read in the *Essai sur les Mœurs*, 'that the contemplation of such works of human genius (as the *Divine Comedy*) is a relief after our mind has been directed to the misfortunes of mankind.' It is true that he soon altered his tone into one of violent and contemptuous depreciation, but his abuse was as efficacious as his praise in familiarising the public with the name, if not with the works, of the sublime poet.

Is not Signor Farinelli a little unjust to Voltaire when he pronounces him incapable of appreciating the highest poetry? Through all the mist of his prejudices, in spite of his education and of the canons of literary orthodoxy in which he was a fervent believer, he recognised in his saner moods the greatness of Shakespeare and Dante. Indeed may we not ask whether it is not the test of really great, of perfect poetry that its value should be recognisable, though perhaps not fully valued, 'semper, ubique, ab omnibus'? If a poem can only be appreciated after a course of study, if we have to transport ourselves by an effort of erudite imagination into the past before we can understand and enjoy it, it so far falls short of perfection. Torelli, a champion of Dante against Voltaire, says that a reader who takes up the *Divine Comedy* qualified by a sound knowledge of Aristotelian and scholastic philosophy, by some acquaintance with physics, geography, astronomy and contemporary history, will find no difficulty in understanding what is before him. Mr Butler advises those who would read the *Paradiso* to study Aristotle *De Coelo*, books I and II, the *Metaphysics*, the poet's *Convito* and *De Monarchia*. If they are spared the whole of Aquinas, it is only because they will find the passages necessary to the comprehension of the text in the notes of Commentators. From which we may infer that when the critics of the age of Voltaire complain that many parts of the sublime poem are crabbed and obscure they are not so benighted as Signor Farinelli would have us believe. So much preparation is not needed for the enjoyment of the *Iliad* or of the book of *Job*, of the *Æneid* or the odes of Horace, of *Le Misanthrope* or of *Hamlet*. These masterpieces must delight all mankind, the learned and unlearned. So also, no doubt, do large parts of the *Divine Comedy* and some passages of the *De Rerum Naturâ*, but as a whole these poems,

although their authors were men of the loftiest genius, do not reach perfection, because Lucretius and Dante have attempted to force into metrical form much that is essentially unpoetic, obscure and abstruse.

Has not the nineteenth century been somewhat blind to those defects in the *Divine Comedy*, considered as a work of art, which the eighteenth century so greatly exaggerated? It could hardly have been otherwise. The Italians in the fervour of aspirations for national unity so happily realised could scarcely be impartial judges of a man who, besides being the creator of their language and one of the glories of their literature, was one of the first and most fervid of patriots. In France and England the reaction in favour of a Catholicism which was not at first altogether that of Rome, the renewed interest in mediæval life and mediæval theology, led many to study with enthusiasm a writer so learned, so religious, so orthodox and yet so unsparing in his denunciation of the corruptions of the church. Historians who wished to understand the Middle Ages or to trace the growth of modern society allowed their delight in the works of Dante as an historical document to blind them to his deficiencies as a poet. To German and other scholars the *Divine Comedy* offered a boundless field for the exercise of painstaking erudition and ingenuity of interpretation, and was therefore regarded with affectionate partiality. But when we judge a poem as a work of art we ought to be unbiassed by the interest it may awaken in us as metaphysicians, theologians, historians, archæologists or interpreters of ænigmas.

If we approach the great poem of Dante in the spirit of pure æsthetic criticism—which was the spirit, however narrow their rules of taste, of the eighteenth century critics—we shall perhaps be forced to allow that, although what there is in it of prosaic has been fused by the fiery vigour and glowing enthusiasm of the author into the outward semblance of poetry, it contains so much that is tedious and obscure that it cannot claim as high a place among those poems which are the most precious treasure of mankind as we should assign to Dante among poets. We may illustrate what we mean by again referring to Lucretius: who as a whole would place the *De Rerum Naturâ* on a level with the *Æneid*? and yet its author possessed a deeper, a richer vein of poetry than that which inspired the consummate art of Virgil.

P. F. Willert.

Oxford.

Les sources et l'évolution des Essais de Montaigne. Par Pierre Villey. Paris: Hachette et C^ie^, 1908. 2 vols. 8vo. x + 422 and 576 pp.

At the opening of his great essay, *On Repentance*, Montaigne warns us that in the portraiture of himself he is 'not painting the whole being but a passing state,' that the portrait 'is a copy of diverse and changeable accidents and of wavering and sometimes contradictory imaginations,' and that 'his soul is always in a state of apprenticeship and probation.'

In spite of this warning many attempts have been made to construct out of Montaigne's *Essays* a well-rounded system of philosophy, and their author has been variously represented as a Sceptic, an Epicurean, and even as a Stoic. The reprint of the edition of 1580 by Dezeimeris and Barckhausen and of that of 1588 by Motheau and Jouaust has made it possible to study, with the expenditure of some trouble, the development of Montaigne's thought, and recently the task has been considerably lightened by the publication of vol. I of the Municipal edition of the famous copy of the 1588 text, with Montaigne's manuscript additions and corrections, which is preserved in the municipal library of Bordeaux. In this edition, admirably edited by M. Strowsky, the successive strata of the essays are conveniently shewn by differences in type and other methods. For the fourth volume a study of the Sources of the Essays by M. Pierre Villey is announced. Meanwhile M. Villey, who has been working at the subject for the last six years, gives us the result of his labours in a complete form, that is to say with ample discussion and with full references to his sources. It may be said at once that no such important contribution to the study of Montaigne has been made for many years.

After fifty pages of introductory matter on the general question of Montaigne's relations to the ethics of the sixteenth century we come to the First Part (I, pp. 51—280) which deals with the books read by Montaigne and the period at which he read them. A comparison with Miss Grace Norton's admirable essay, *Montaigne as a reader*, in her *Studies in Montaigne*, 1904, and with her list of authors read by him will shew how great an advance M. Villey has made. I will only note that his method is thoroughly sound, and that he carefully distinguishes between fact and hypothesis. Authors are arranged in alphabetical order, so that reference is easy. Among the less known is López de Gómara, from whose popular *Historia general de las Indias*, published in 1553, and translated into French in 1584, Montaigne borrowed largely.

The rest of M. Villey's first volume has for its subject the chronology of the Essays, and is perhaps the most important part of the whole work. The result of his investigations is that the essays of Books I and II may be arranged in four periods of composition as follows:

(1) 1572. I, 2—22, 26 (part), 31—48, and II, 1;
(2) 1573–74. II, 2—6;
(3) 1575–76. II, 12 (part), 14, 15 (this is in some measure conjectural);
(4) 1578–80. I, 1, 25, 27 (end), 28, 53, and II, 7, 11, 16—37[1].

During the last period M. Villey thinks important additions were made to I, 20, and II, 12, and some other essays. There is no indication of date for the remaining essays of Books I and II, but M. Villey conjectures

[1] I have used the numbering of the 1595 text for the chapters of Book I. In the earlier editions XL was numbered XIV.

that I, 24, *Du pedantisme*, was written between 1572 and 1578, and I, 49—52 soon after 1572. With regard to the essay which stands first of all he suggests that it was written about 1578 (mainly on the ground that the example of the emperor Conrad comes from Bodin's *Methodus ad facilem historiarum cognitionem*, which he shews Montaigne read about that year), and that Montaigne purposely put it at the beginning of his book on account of its subject, namely, the diversity and inconstancy of man. This is very likely.

I have not space here to discuss all the careful arguments which M. Villey adduces for the chronology of each essay, but one or two points call for especial notice. His theory, which he only presents as conjectural, with regard to the *Apologie de Raimond de Sebonde* is that it consists of three principal fragments, of which the first was written about 1573, the last about 1576, and the middle one, ending with the address to the princess, between 1578 and 1580. Without accepting this view in its entirety one may readily agree with that part of it which assigns the last part, with its numerous borrowings from Sextus Empiricus, to the neighbourhood of the year 1576. For it was in January or February of this year that Montaigne struck his Pyrrhonist medal. With regard to II, 17, *On Presumption*, an essay of great importance, for it is the first one in which he gives us a full-length portrait of himself, I have expressed elsewhere my dissent from M. Bonnefon's view that it was written as early as 1573 or 1574[1], and I agree with M. Villey in assigning it on various grounds to the period 1578–1580. It is closely connected both with the essay which precedes it and the one which follows it, so that they too probably belong to the same period. The chronology of the Third Book presents no difficulty. M. Villey agrees with me that Montaigne did not begin this Book till at least the close of the year 1585, and we know that it was completed by February 1588.

Having established these *data* M. Villey in his second volume deals with the evolution of the Essays, or in other words with the development of Montaigne's art and thought.

In the first half of the sixteenth century there was a class of book which had an immense popularity. It may be said to have begun with Erasmus's *Adagia* (1500) and may be best described in the words applied by Mark Pattison to that work as 'a manual of the art and wisdom of the ancient world for the use of the modern.' The *Adagia* were aphorisms, or as they were then called 'sentences.' When these were put in the mouths of great men they were called 'Apophthegms.' Such were the *Apophthegmata* of Erasmus and the *Propos memorables* of the Paris bookseller, Gilles Corrozet. Similar in character as being equally of a moral import were the collections of 'Examples,' or anecdotes, such as the *De dictis et factis memoralibus* of Battista Fregoso, and the *Officina* of Ravisius Textor, both of which were largely used by Rabelais. Another work from which Rabelais drew was the *Lectionum antiquarum*

[1] Montaigne speaks of himself as *ayant franchi les quarante ans.*

libri xvi of Coelius Rhodiginus, which combined aphorism with anecdote, and amusement with moral instruction. A similar work, written in the vernacular, was the *Silva de varia leccion* of Pedro Mexia (1542), of which a French translation was published in 1552 under the title of *Les diverses leçons*. Of the same character were various books which appeared not long before the *Essays*, such as, the *Anthologie* of Pierre Breslay, the *Académie françoise* of La Primaudaye (a work much read in this country), the *Suite des diverses leçons de Pierre Messie* of Du Verdier, and the highly popular *Théâtre du Monde* of Pierre Boaistuau. Montaigne's earliest essays were, as M. Villey says, mere *Leçons*, or, as I have described them elsewhere, 'an anecdote or two, with a few remarks by way of moral.' M. Villey gives as a typical example I, xv, *De la punition de la couardise*.

Soon we come upon another type of essay, more fully developed, and altogether more interesting, but still preserving the mosaic character and with very little of Montaigne in it. Such are I, 40 (originally 14), 37, 42 and II, 1. The first of these M. Villey takes as a type of the longer essay of the first period. As he points out, its composition is extremely simple and regular. It opens with a saying of Epictetus, which Montaigne found in Stobaeus, that men are tormented by their opinion of things, and not by the things themselves. Then, after two paragraphs which are possibly original, the essay is built up in a perfectly symmetrical fashion. First we have a few aphorisms on the contempt for death, followed by numerous examples. Then we have a few aphorisms on the contempt for pain, followed by more examples. Finally there is a short conclusion, which is almost directly translated from Seneca. In this group of essays M. Villey includes I, 19, *Que philosopher c'est apprendre à mourir*, and he is on the whole right in doing so, for much of the essay is borrowed from ancient sources, especially from Lucretius, and its ideas hardly go beyond the range of the great commonplaces. But from the artistic point of view the essay is significant as being the first (he was writing it on March 15, 1572) in which Montaigne attempts a higher flight, in which he writes as a poet as well as a moralist, in which he introduces at any rate one important personal element, his imagination.

During this period the dominating influence is Stoicism—the mitigated Stoicism of Seneca, whose ideas and even style colour all the early essays. This Stoical phase through which Montaigne passed was due in part to the influence of his friend La Boétie. It was a Stoicism which, as M. Villey well points out, had nothing original in it, and nothing Christian. Montaigne gradually drew clear of it, but there was no violent rupture, no such hard and fast demarcation between the Stoical and the Sceptical phase as M. Strowski seems to imply[1]. Throughout his life Montaigne could be roused to enthusiasm by the contemplation of Stoical ideals. It was the influence of Plutarch which helped to wean him from Stoicism. Amyot's translation of the *Moralia*

[1] F. Strowski, *Montaigne*, 1906.

appeared in August 1572, and M. Villey shews that Montaigne must have become acquainted with it towards the close of the year. We know how much he was indebted to Amyot, and even more to the *Œuvres morales* than to the *Lives*. The *Lives*, M. Villey points out, influenced his work in two ways; they put more sap and vitality into the essays, as for instance I, 22 and 47, and they gave a more complex and subtle character to his psychology. He began to realise that life was less simple than the Stoics represented it to be. One of the earliest essays to shew the trace of the *Œuvres morales* is II, 4, *A demain les affaires*, which opens with the well-known tribute to Amyot —*Je donne la palme à Jacques Amyot sur touts noz escrivains François.*

M. Villey's treatment of Montaigne's scepticism, or, as he calls it, his relativism, is excellent (II, pp. 155—235). We have the beginning of it in two essays of the first period I, 31 and 47 (*De l'incertitude de nostre jugement*), and no doubt the religious wars, especially after the massacre of St Bartholomew, contributed greatly to its development. But the crisis was determined by Henri Estienne's Latin translation of Sextus Empiricus (1562). It was from Sextus that he derived most of the inscriptions for his library and it is reasonable to assume that the medal which he struck early in 1576 gives us approximately the date of the crisis. M. Strowski says that the most important source of the *Apologie de Raimond de Sebonde* is the *Examen vanitatis doctrinae gentium* of Giovanni Francesco Pico della Mirandola, a nephew of the great humanist (p. 125), but M. Villey can find no direct traces of this work in Montaigne. As regards the well-known treatise of Cornelius Agrippa, *De incertitudine et vanitate scientiarum*, he points out that Montaigne is indebted to it for puerile paradox rather than for serious argument, and that it is in fact to be regarded as an amusing manual of paradoxes, or at best as 'an ironical pamphlet against stupidity' (Strowski), rather than as a serious contribution to sceptical philosophy[1]. Another source, to which M. Villey for the first time calls attention, is *Les Dialogues de Guy de Brués, contre les nouveaux Academiciens* (1557), an obscure and feeble work by a friend of Ronsard. 'The great novelty of the *Apology* and its governing thought is that we have "no communication with Being," and that we only know changing phenomena.' This is one of the best and most informing remarks that has ever been made on the *Apology*. Though the acute sceptical phase which is represented by this essay passed away, 'it left behind it,' notes M. Villey, 'two important traces, a great intellectual prudence and the principle of the imitation of nature.' To Montaigne's philosophy of Nature he devotes a whole chapter (pp. 375—436), but the subject is far too large a one to be discussed here. By 'intellectual prudence' he means that Montaigne henceforth abandoned hasty moral generalisations in favour of the more modest position that morality is to a large extent relative to the age and to the individual.

It will have been noticed that in M. Villey's chronology of the

[1] The French translation of Agrippa is by Louis Turquet, and not by Gueudeville, as M. Strowski says.

Essays all that he assigns, and that conjecturally, to the period from 1574 to the end of 1577 are part of the *Apology*, and two short essays, also of a sceptical character, II, 14 and 15. But he points out (I, 387) that to this period may also belong the essays which were stolen from Montaigne by his secretary, as well as some of those which have no indication of date. He further suggests that during this period his work was interrupted by the fact that he was serving in the army. It seems to me, however, extremely unlikely that after St Bartholomew Montaigne should have served on the Catholic side, and equally unlikely that he should have thrown in his lot, as has also been conjectured, with the Protestants. It is far easier to agree with M. Villey when he makes Montaigne's conception of the relativity of morality the starting-point for his portraiture of himself. Among other influences he notices the growing interest of the age in biography and autobiography, and Montaigne's own predilection for Plutarch, Suetonius, and Horace. On the influence of Horace M. Villey is especially good (pp. 141—145). The resemblance between the two men is indeed remarkable: they belong to the same family, a family of which Sainte-Beuve, who claimed them and Bayle as his masters, was also an illustrious member.

It is in the essays written during the last period of the First Book (1578—80) that Montaigne's design of making himself the subject of his book appears fully matured. In II, 6 *On Practice*, written at the latest in 1574, we already find a premonition of his intention. 'I am not writing as a teacher, but as a student: it is not another man's lesson, it is my own,' are the concluding words of the essay in the 1580 edition. But it is not till I, 25 *On the Education of Children*, II, 8 *On the affection of Fathers for Children*, II, 10 *On Books*, that he begins to put his design into execution, and it is not till II, 17 *On Presumption*, that he gives free play to it. But it is in the Third Book and in the additions made to the earlier books that we get the full benefit of his intention. During the years 1586—88 he finds an inexhaustible theme in his personal experiences, his personal tastes and opinions, and he produces his richest and most original essays. I cannot agree with M. Villey that he tells us too much about his idiosyncrasies. It is interesting to know that he never had his bed warmed, that he did not care for fruit except melons, that he liked all sauces and preferred stinking fish to fresh. Montaigne did not write only for philosophers but for the world in general. That is one of the secrets of his abiding charm.

In the additions which Montaigne made to the *Essays* during the last years of his life, and which were embodied in the posthumous edition of 1595, his confidences are, in truth, sometimes indiscreet, and M. Villey is right in saying that an increasing libertinism is a note of these years. But he is equally right in ascribing this to an excess of frankness, with a spice of affectation, and not to senility or dilettantism. M. Strowski's view that dilettantism is the final word of Montaigne's philosophy is not borne out, as he supposes, by the character of the books which he read during his last years. On the contrary Montaigne

read more assiduously and more methodically than before, and the books that he read were for the most part of an extremely solid character. Aristotle's *Ethics*, Plato, Diogenes Laertius, Xenophon's *Anabasis*, Herodotus, Livy, Quintilian, Cicero's *Academica*, *de natura deorum*, and *de divinatione* are not the books of a dilettante. The manuscript additions to the Bordeaux copy of the edition of 1588 bear ample testimony to Montaigne's reading. It is this rather than any fresh intellectual current that colours his writing from 1588 to his death.

There are many other points in M. Villey's book that I should like to have noticed, such as the influence of the *conteurs* and of Seneca on Montaigne's style (II, 299 and 538), his increasing love of brevity (II, 542), and his debt to Amyot for some of his metaphors (II, 302). M. Villey writes with judgment and penetration of his religion, saying of it that its distinctive character is the absence of all religious feeling (II, 323—335), and there is an interesting chapter on *Montaigne honnête homme* (II, 436—490), at the close of which he compares him in this character to La Rochefoucauld. He might have added that he was the favourite author of M^me^ de Sablé, in whose salon La Rochefoucauld's *Maxims* were shaped and polished. Finally, one word by way of general criticism. M. Villey's book is admirable in substance, independent, cautious, thorough; but in point of form it is somewhat diffuse. There is a certain amount of repetition. Had the work been subjected to a more careful condensing and refining process, it would have been more effective as a whole, easier to grasp, more striking in its impression. In these days of many books, a thousand pages make a severe demand on the reader, even when the subject is Montaigne.

ARTHUR TILLEY.

CAMBRIDGE.

Henslowe's Diary. Edited by WALTER W. GREG. Part I, Text. Part II, Commentary. London: A. H. Bullen. 1904, 1908. Crown 4to. lii + 240 and xvi + 400 pp.

Mr Greg's work upon Henslowe is a most notable contribution towards the redemption of the history of the Elizabethan stage for scholarship from the disrepute into which the tricks of the forger and the impertinence of the sciolist have brought it. He has now furnished a minutely accurate text of the famous diary, a collection, separately issued under the title *Henslowe Papers* (1907), of illustrative documents from the Dulwich archives, and a volume of elaborate commentary, in which are discussed in turn the personality and fortunes of Philip Henslowe himself, the companies of actors and the theatres with which his dramatic speculations were involved, and the individual plays and men, for so many of whom a reference in his business-like pages has secured a somewhat surprising rescue from oblivion. It is not necessary, in the *Modern Language Review*, to

dwell either upon the first-rate importance of the Dulwich manuscripts to the student of Elizabethan life in general and of the Elizabethan drama in particular, or upon the exceptional merits of their latest editor. Mr Greg's sound judgment and remorseless patience are by this time familiar even to those who have not, like myself, had the privilege of working with him. I shall best discharge my present duty by avoiding all attempt at giving a summary of his book, and confining myself to a few isolated points of controversy, as to which, in the interpretation of admittedly intricate and difficult evidence, I feel bound to interpret otherwise. I am but gleaning where Mr Greg has reaped, and must pass over page after page upon which I have nothing to express but the most complete assent and admiration.

Mr Greg has dealt fully and finally with the forgeries introduced by Collier into the *Diary* itself, and in his general handling of stage history has steered very clear of the pitfalls dug for his successors by that mischievous antiquary. I have only noted one passage where I suspect that he has himself been trapped. This is in a statement (II, 108) that the actor William Kempe 'is found with the Queen's Revels' company in 1605.' There is an *a priori* improbability about this, because the Queen's Revels was a company of boys. I suppose that Mr Greg rests it upon a 'memorandum' quoted by Collier in his *Memoirs of the Actors* as 'derived from the civic archives' for 1605, to the effect that 'Kempe, Armyn, and others, plaiers at the Blacke Fryers' had brought certain aldermen of the City upon the stage. There is nothing else to connect either Kempe or Armin with the Blackfriars in 1605. Collier does not, of course, give an exact reference. I like not the security, and my suspicions are confirmed by turning up Mr Sidney Lee's account of Kempe in the *D.N.B.*, and finding that 'the town clerk of London denies the existence of such a document.'

On the other hand the recent German theory that the mysterious *ne*'s attached to certain records of play-performances in the diary are to be ascribed to Collier is reprobated on palaeographical grounds by Mr Greg. There can hardly be a doubt that, whatever the exact significance of these letters may be—'ne[w],' or 'n[ew] e[nterlude],' or what-not—they indicate what we should now call a 'first night,' either of a wholly new play, or perhaps in some instances of a 'revival.' But I part company from Mr Greg when he assigns (II, 167, 174) the same meaning to the sign 'j,' which appears against the performance of *Tamberlaine* on 30 August 1594, and that of *Long Meg of Westminster* on 14 February 1595. The alternative explanation, which indeed Mr Greg himself suggests, that it indicated the First Part of a play written in two parts, seems to me far more plausible. There was a *ne* on 27 August 1594 and there was a *ne* on 11 February 1595, and Mr Greg's theory would make these two occasions the only ones on which two new plays in the same week are recorded in the diary. Moreover, on 10 March 1595, Henslowe notes '17 p frome hence lycensed.' Now, if *Tamberlaine* and *Long Meg of Westminster* are left out of account, the Admiral's men had produced exactly 17 new plays,

since they began with *Bellendon* on 8 June 1594. Mr Greg (II, 115) explains this note rather differently, as referring to 'exactly the number of the plays in the repertory at the moment, that is, of the plays entered as performed by the Admiral's men both before and after the date in question'; but I think that my interpretation is the more simple and natural one.

Mr Greg has devoted great pains and ingenuity to the disentangling of Henslowe's bookkeeping, and I think that his conclusions are sometimes right. I am not sure, however, that he has solved the financial *crux* presented by the accounts of 1597, in which Henslowe makes not a single but a double money entry against each performance. I agree with him that the first two money columns represent pounds and shillings, and the last three pounds, shillings and pence, and that the pounds and shillings continue the series of gallery takings recorded in other parts of the book. But it seems to me very doubtful whether the pounds, shillings and pence can, as Mr Greg suggests (II, 131), 'represent the sums which Henslowe was able every now and then to squeeze out of the company towards the repayment of the moneys advanced' by him on the company's behalf. There are several difficulties in this explanation. One is that such repayments, when they do occur in the diary, are stated, as one would expect, in round sums of pounds and shillings without pence. Another is that repayments squeezed out from day to day would naturally fluctuate with the success of the theatre and therefore with the amounts taken in gallery-money. There is no such relation here. The entries in question do fluctuate, but quite independently of the gallery-money. Moreover, it is noticeable that nearly half the total amounts which they represent falls within the first 24 of the 127 days for which this particular account runs. Both this unequal distribution and the inclusion of pence suggest outgoings rather than repayments, and on the whole it seems to me probable that Henslowe is entering side by side with his gallery-receipts, not the repayments of his advances for the company, but the advances themselves as he made them day by day. But I admit that, if so, there are duplicate and differing entries of payments on another page for two of the days in question which I have no means of explaining. When Mr Greg comes (II, 135) to summarize the total outcome of Henslowe's financial transactions with the Admiral's men from 1597 to 1604, I feel sure that he goes wrong at more than one point. For example, Henslowe did not, as he suggests, credit the company on 28 July 1598 with receipts up to date of £125 as against payments of £167. 2*s*. 7*d*. and carry forward a balance in his own favour of £42. 2*s*. 7*d*. Probably the £125 went to an old debt. In any case Henslowe carried forward the whole of the £167. 2*s*. 7*d*. against the company. This correction makes the entry of £233. 17*s*. 7*d*. as due to Henslowe on 24 February 1599, which puzzles Mr Greg, intelligible enough. Henslowe has corrected an error of 5*s*. in his previous statement of his advances for 1597–8, making it £166. 17*s*. 7*d*. He has added his further advances of £314. 3*s*. 0*d*. up to 16 February 1599, and has deducted

his actual receipts during 1598–9 up to 24 February, amounting to £247. 3*s.* 0*d.* The balance in his favour is in fact £233. 17*s.* 7*d.* These are not the only misunderstandings in Mr Greg's paragraph, which really requires a complete reconsideration.

It is a pleasure to turn from finance to the personalities of famous men. Edward Alleyn, the Roscius of the Elizabethan stage, is recorded in the diary to have 'leafte playnge' some time before 29 December 1597. Mr Greg regards this as a very temporary retirement, and thinks that Alleyn was back on the boards in 1598. I think, on the other hand, that he did not return until 1600. Mr Greg relies on the appearance of Alleyn's name in the plot of *The Battle of Alcazar*, which he dates in 1598. To this I reply that the plot may belong to December 1597, and may be as late as 1601 or thereabouts. I think it is in favour of my view that on 26 September 1598 Alleyn was at The Brill in Sussex, and that Henslowe, writing to him there (*Henslowe Papers*, 48), talks of 'my company,' as if Alleyn were not directly concerned with it. But my strongest argument rests on the terms of a letter written by the Privy Council to the Middlesex Justices on 8 April 1600, to favour the building of the Fortune (*Henslowe Papers*, 51). This letter recites that 'her Ma^{tie} (haveinge been well pleased heeretofere at tymes of recreacõn wth the services of Edward Allen and his Companie; Servante to me the Earle of Nottingham wheareof, of late he hath made discontynuance) Hath sondrye tymes signified her pleasuer, that he should revive the same agayne.' Mr Greg finds the phrasing odd, because there had been no cessation of activity at the Rose, and the Admiral's men had duly appeared at court during the Christmas of 1599–1600. But surely the point is that Alleyn was not with them in person.

Collier interpolated in the diary three forged entries concerning the unfortunate play of *The Isle of Dogs*, which led to the closing of the theatres in 1597. Mr Greg clears these away and leaves a single genuine mention of the play. This occurs in a note of an agreement between Henslowe and the actor William Borne on 10 August 1597, under which Borne binds himself to begin playing at the Rose 'Imediatly after this Restraynt is Recaled by the lordes of the cownsell w^{ch} Restraynt is by the meanes of playinge the Ieylle of dooges.' Mr Greg suggests that possibly the performance of *The Isle of Dogs* took place on 20 July. This date is entered by Henslowe in the diary, but no play-name or receipt is entered against it. Having eliminated the forgeries, however, Mr Greg leaves himself with no proof that the play was produced by the Admiral's men at all. Collier's well-known extract from the Privy Council register, which records the imprisonment of some of the players, 'whereof one of them was not only an actor, but a maker of parte of the said plaie,' only describes it as 'plaied in one of the plaiehowses on the Bancke side'; and this might have been the Swan. That Nash had a share in the composition may be regarded as established, but there is no trace of any other connection between Nash and Henslowe. I am fortunate enough to be able to produce some

further evidence on the matter which, as far as I know, has never been used. On 8 October, 1597, the Privy Council (*Acts*, xxviii. 33) issued two warrants to the keeper of the Marshalsea, one 'to release Gabriell Spencer and Robert Shaa, stage-players, out of prison, who were of lat comitted to his custodie,' and the other 'a like warrant for the releasing of Benjamin Johnson.' The important new fact here is, of course, the inference to be drawn from the two entries in the register taken together, that Ben Jonson and not, as Mr Greg guesses, Samuel Rowley or Thomas Heywood, was Nash's collaborator in *The Isle of Dogs*. Of this there is no hint either in Prof. Herford's *D. N. B.* article, or in the quite recent and Gargantuan biography by M. Maurice Castelain. But I think that doubt is also thrown upon the responsibility of Henslowe and the Admiral's men for the offending performance. The warrants were issued three days before Shaw and Spencer began to play for Henslowe in a reconstructed Admiral's company, to which recruits from Pembroke's men had been added. This is the earliest appearance of Spencer in the diary. The earliest appearance of Shaw is on the previous 6 August, when Richard Jones became security to a covenant by him to play for Henslowe. The procedure is, no doubt, explained by his imprisonment. Mr Greg has an ingenious argument to prove that Spencer, at least, was one of the importations from Pembroke's men; and if so, it would seem at least possible that Pembroke's, rather than the Admiral's, were the producers of *The Isle of Dogs*, and thereby caused the general restraint of all theatres on 28 July, 1597. On the other hand, Ben Jonson was in financial relationship with Henslowe as early as 28 July, for on that very day he borrowed £5 of him, perhaps to meet the expenses of his arrest; and it is conceivable that the Pembroke's men came into the Admiral's company a few months earlier than could be inferred from the account-heading of 11 October.

Shakespeare, like Nash, is not mentioned in the diary. Mr Greg's argument to prove that Gabriel Spencer and Humphrey Jeffes joined the Admiral's men from Pembroke's in 1597 is based upon the occurrence of the names 'Humfrey' and 'Gabriel,' probably as those of actors, in 3 *Henry VI* as printed in the Folio of 1623, and upon the publication of an earlier version of 3 *Henry VI* with the name of Pembroke's men on its title-page in 1595. But the inference that Shakespeare had once been with Pembroke's company, which he regards as 'quite groundless,' seems to me, on the other hand, rather plausible. The only reasonable explanation of the appearance of 3 *Henry VI* in the Folio is that Shakespeare, if he did not write it, at any rate revised it, and if Pembroke's men played in the revised version, there is at least a fair probability that it was revised for them. Now there is no trace of the existence of Pembroke's men until 1592, in the winter of which year they appeared at court. It is true that Mr Fleay has narrated a whole history of the company between 1589 and 1592, but it rests upon nothing. In 1593 they travelled, and by August they were back in London and had had to sell their apparel. My conjecture is that they may have originated in 1592, out of

a division for travelling purposes of the rather inflated London company which had been formed by the combination of Strange's and the Admiral's. If so, they probably took over the York and Lancaster series of plays, including 1 *Henry VI* as written or revised by Shakespeare for Strange's and produced at the Rose on 3 March 1592, and also the two parts of *The Contention of York and Lancaster*. These Shakespeare may have revised for them and may also have completed by the addition of *Richard III*, during their London winter of 1592–3. I see no reason why he should not also have continued to write for Strange's, and in fact I suspect that 'the gelyous comodey,' which is entered in the diary as a new play on 5 January 1593, was *The Comedy of Errors*. I do not know that Shakespeare travelled with any company during 1593; he may have been in Italy. But if he did, it is more likely to have been with Pembroke's than with Strange's. The names of nine of Strange's men during this tour are upon record, and his is not one of them. In August Pembroke's were in difficulties and, as Mr Greg suggests, probably sold their books as well as their apparel. Title-pages show that, in addition to the York and Lancaster plays, they held *Titus Andronicus*, probably in the version produced for the first time as *Titus and Vespasian* by Strange's on 11 April 1592, and *The Taming of A Shrew*. If so, they must have taken over the former play from Strange's, not in 1592 but in 1593, as Strange's were playing it up to 25 January 1593. Mr Greg (II, 85) supposes that in the autumn of 1593 their stock was acquired by Strange's and so passed to the Chamberlain's men. But it is also possible that it was taken over by Sussex's and passed from them to the Chamberlain's in the summer of 1594. This I infer from the fact that on 23 January 1594 Sussex's produced *Titus Andronicus*, which I take to be Shakespeare's extant revision of *Titus and Vespasian*, as a new play for Henslowe. A few days later, on 6 February 1594, plays were stopped by the plague, and on the very same day *Titus Andronicus* was entered in the Stationers' Register. It was published in the course of the year, and its title-page bore the names of the three companies, Derby's (i.e. Strange's), Pembroke's and Sussex's, in the precise order in which, according to my view but not according to Mr Greg's, who does not accept *Titus and Vespasian* as an early version of *Titus Andronicus*, they had been connected with it. I have been prolix in expounding this conjecture as to the outline of Shakespeare's career from 1592 to 1594, because it differs so sharply from the traditional conjecture adopted by Mr Greg, according to which Shakespeare's relations were confined, at any rate from 1592 onwards, to a single company, known up to 1594 as Strange's, and afterwards as the Chamberlain's. While I am conjecturing, I may as well go the whole hog, and add that I have sometimes wondered whether the *Buckingham*, which Sussex's were playing in the winter of 1593–4, was not an early version of *Henry VIII*. The Shakespeare and Fletcher play of 1613 reads to me like a rehandling of a piece belonging to the days of the chronicle history.

I could go on raising minor controversies with Mr Greg for some

time yet. I am not satisfied with the distinction he draws between the sharers in the Admiral's company and Henslowe's covenant servants; or with his theory that the diary must not be looked upon as showing all the payments made by or on behalf of the Admiral's men for plays during the period to which it relates. But the evidence on both these points is too long for analysis in a review, and I would rather end, as I began, on a note of gratitude to Mr Greg for a book which few scholars would have had the energy to undertake or to carry through with so much thoroughness and minuteness.

E. K. Chambers.

London.

The New Inn or The Light Heart. By Ben Jonson. Edited by G. B. Tennant. (Yale Studies in English, xxxiv.) New York: Henry Holt, 1908. 8vo. lxxiii + 340 pp.

After alluding to the fact that this play is not found in the additional Jonson folio of 1640, Dr Tennant continues: 'That the reason for its omission lay in its peculiarity of form [8vo.] is very evident; for whereas his other plays could be reprinted from their original type, and then bound together, this comedy would have needed to be entirely reset.' It is difficult at first to grasp the state of mind in which an editor makes a remark of this sort, and yet when one comes to look into the case it is pretty clear how the mistake arose. The *New Inn* was printed in octavo in 1631, and it will be remembered that the same date occurs on the title-pages of the first three plays in 1640 folio. Dr Tennant has obviously jumped at the conclusion that these plays were published in folio in 1631, that the type was kept standing for nine or ten years and was then used for printing the first section of the collected edition. Had this been the case it is pretty certain that the printer of that edition would have altered the date before reprinting from the old type. But the supposition of type standing for ten years is utterly inadmissible. The three plays in question were of course printed in 1631 and the type distributed. They were not intended for separate issue, for the signatures are connected. It is now usual to assume that Jonson began to collect his later works for an additional folio about 1631, and that these three plays were printed before he again dropt the scheme. Whether any copies were issued is not known, but the bulk of the edition certainly came into the hands of the publisher of the second volume of 1640 (Richard Meighen). There was no question of including in the volume editions of plays which had been put on the market singly at an earlier date; while the fact that the *New Inn* had been already printed in octavo cannot have stood in the way of its being reprinted, since several masques are included of which individual quartos had previously appeared. Probably the play was simply overlooked; unless, indeed, we are to suppose that Sir Kenelm Digby, the editor, preferred to ignore Ben's failure and the splenetic outpourings that followed it.

A few pages later we find Dr Tennant in difficulties over the date 1629 given on the title-page as that of performance. The difficulty appears to be that the date is correct. The play was acted on January 19, 1629. Dr Tennant seems to think that, being before March 25, this should have been given in the original as 1628. He ought, however, to have known that the practice varied greatly at the time, and if he will turn to Prof. Thorndike's useful study of the *Influence of Beaumont and Fletcher on Shakspere* (p. 17) he will find conclusive evidence that Jonson began the year on January 1.

After this there is very little to find fault with in what is throughout an altogether solid and able piece of work. I am afraid that the editor is only too right when he says that Jonson had nobody but himself to blame for the failure of a play which deserved no better, and, moreover, that though the work may not be comparable with the author's great pieces, it by no means stands apart from the rest of his production, but merely shows in an aggravated form defects which may be traced throughout. A minor point is the curious assertion that the play was hissed 'Because the Chambermaid was namèd Cis.' When we consider that in revising the play Jonson not only altered the name to Pru, but picked out this single incident as the subject for an epilogue for the court, I think it will be admitted that the name must have borne some suggestion to a contemporary audience which is lost to us. While, however, disagreeing with the editor on this point, I have no explanation to offer. Throughout his criticism of the play, and also his remarks upon the atrabilious writings with which the author followed it up, Dr Tennant has ample opportunity of exposing the utter perversion of evidence of which Gifford was guilty in his not ungenerous defence of Jonson, and of the meekness with which he has been followed by writers who should have known better. Among other things Dr Tennant shows, I think, that the version of the *Ode* containing the ill-natured sneer at Brome is the original. On this point the late F. G. Fleay evinced more sense than other critics though he proved himself erratic enough elsewhere.

One episode in the *New Inn* is also found in the *Widow*, from which the editor assumes that it was borrowed. He is probably right, for the incident forms an integral part of both plays, but it is worth while observing (which Dr Tennant does not) that the *Widow* though probably written somewhere about 1625 was first printed (as by Jonson, Fletcher, and Middleton) in 1652, twenty-one years after the *New Inn*. Apparently we must regard it as one of those cases in which at the end of his life Jonson wove into his plays fragments of earlier work done in collaboration with other writers. Such patching has already been pointed out by Dr De Winter and Mr Crawford in the *Staple of News*. Then again there is the noteworthy fact that the *New Inn* contains two passages of considerable length which recur almost verbatim in *Love's Pilgrimage* first printed in the Beaumont and Fletcher folio of 1647. Here, however, it seems impossible to decide for certain whether (i) Jonson was concerned in the original composition

of *Love's Pilgrimage* and reclaimed his own work, whether (ii) Jonson in the *New Inn* borrowed work of Fletcher's, or whether (iii) the passage from the *New Inn* was inserted in *Love's Pilgrimage* between 1631 and 1647. Dr Tennant favours the last alternative.

The text aims at being an exact reprint in all but typographical arrangement of the accurately though not very well printed original. Even obvious misprints are retained, the readings of later editions being recorded at the foot of the page. So far as it has been possible to check it the text seems quite correct. I only remark that whereas the editor began by printing 'i' the' &c. where the original has 'i'the' &c., he altered his practice during the course of his work and towards the end follows the original in this detail. Great pains have evidently been taken to make the text thoroughly trustworthy, while at the same time much learning has been collected in the introduction and notes.

W. W. Greg.

Cambridge.

The Knight of the Burning Pestle. By Beaumont and Fletcher. Edited by H. S. Murch. (Yale Studies in English, xxxiii.) New York: Henry Holt, 1908. 8vo. cxiv + 310 pp.

Dr Murch's edition of the *Knight of the Burning Pestle* is a thoroughly unsatisfactory piece of work. This does not mean that a great deal of labour and a considerable amount of erudition has not gone to its production, but that it is marked by a lack of editorial competency, a want of critical temper, and grave lapses of attention which deprive it of a large part of the value it ought to have possessed.

The character of the work becomes obvious on the very first page. 'Owing, no doubt, to the unsettled condition of orthography at the time, inconsistencies in spelling, also, are to be found in the quarto.' Was there ever a more fatuous remark? 'All things considered,' again, the editor has actually decided to adopt for his edition the only authoritative text. There are three quartos, one of 1613, and two dated 1635. These are numbered 1, 2, 3; but no identification marks are given to distinguish those bearing the same date, so that the student is forced to rummage among the collations to discover which quarto is called 2 and which 3. Neither are we definitely told whether Q2 is printed from Q1 and Q3 from Q2, though both these facts follow from the collations quoted. Of the folio it is said that 'An examination of its readings...will show that the quartos of 1635, rather than the quarto of 1613, are depended upon.' This is culpable vagueness. The folio, as the collations show, was printed from Q3. Now the quarto which has the readings here (correctly) ascribed to Q2 is distinguished by having on the title-page the name 'Beaumont' in the usual spelling, while in that with the Q3 readings the name is spelt 'Beamount'; and I may incidentally remark that this third quarto though dated, like the second, 1635, was quite likely not printed till fifteen or twenty years later. It may seem

hypercritical to insist upon Dr Murch's failure properly to distinguish these two quartos; but it so happens that it has led him into a curious and rather bad error. At the end of the text, namely, he has reprinted the preliminary matter peculiar to the later editions. He states definitely that the reprint is made from 'the Second Quarto, 1635,' but as a matter of fact it is from the 'Beamount' quarto which he has in his collations quite correctly called Q3. There are, moreover, several inaccuracies in this reprint, the chief being the omission of the imprint 'Printed by *N. O.* for *I. S.* 1635.' from the title-page.

To resume. Utterly misleading are such statements as that 'rich and influential tradesmen and their aggressive wives...more and more under James I assumed a sort of dictatorship over the theatre.' The contrary is true, for the merchant class was becoming more and more pronouncedly puritan and the puritans more and more opposed to all theatrical activity. Throughout James' and Charles' reigns the drama became continuously less bourgeois and more aristocratic. Again, speaking of the revival Dr Murch says: 'It is probable that, as given at the Cockpit, it was acted before aristocratic spectators, since that theatre was a "private house."' But so was the Blackfriars, at which the original performance in all probability took place. The change was in the character of the audience, not of the house, and shows that the civic was a diminishing, not an increasing element. The editor quotes Langbaine for a revival with a prologue spoken by Nell Gwyn, and Genest for one in 1682. 'So far as I am aware,' he adds, 'it has been only recently revived, and, moreover, only in America.' The statement will not pass unnoticed by those who remember Mr Nigel Playfair's admirable impersonation of Ralph. Nor was that the first modern revival in this country.

A list of plays 'which have a more or less evident relation to the romances,' i.e. the chivalric romances, includes the *Trial of Chivalry*. This is in no way chivalric: the editor has presumably not read it. In the same list *Uter Pendragon* is dated 1589. It was a new play on April 29, 1597. *Sir Clyomon* is said to be 'evidently based directly upon some lost romance.' This is guess work of the worst sort; for my own part I do not believe it. Worse than this by far is the omission of all mention of the *Old Wives Tale*, that remarkable predecessor of the *Knight of the Burning Pestle* in the field of chivalric burlesque, though the editor goes as far afield and as wide of the mark as *Thersytes* in his search for parallels.

The question of authorship has always been a difficult one, though critics are agreed in assigning a predominant share to Beaumont. The present editor gives him all but the Luce-Jasper scenes (he is unfortunately vague in the exact delimitation). This means ascribing III 1—150, with a proportion of double endings as low as 33 per cent., to Fletcher on the strength of a low proportion of run-on lines. This seems a very doubtful proceeding, in view of the fact that Fletcher's usual percentage is about 70. Unless, moreover, these various tests give approximately consonant results, what weight can they carry?

As regards the production of the play Dr Murch concludes that it was performed by a children's company in 1610. But there is very little doubt that we must assign it to the Blackfriars house, and the editor has come no nearer than his predecessors to explaining the passage which seems to imply that the house where the play was acted had then been open seven years. The Blackfriars was open before the end of the sixteenth century. It does not in the least help matters to suggest that the performance may 'have been at another theatre than Blackfriars,' for no known house was opened in 1603. After Mr Chambers' arguments in the *Modern Language Review* for last January (p. 161) there can be little doubt that the true date is 1607.

The question of the dependence of the play on *Don Quixote* is treated at length and a pretty conclusive case seems to be made out for referring all cases of alleged similarity either to natural coincidence arising out of the common situation or to dependence on the romances of chivalry themselves. The chief sources seem to be *Amadis*, *Palmerin de Oliva*, *Palmerin of England* and the *Mirror of Knighthood*. The subject is well treated and forms much the best section of the Introduction. The least commendable section, on the other hand, is perhaps that headed 'Objects of the Satire.' This includes miscellaneous observations on chivalric romances and their dramatic offspring, the civic drama with its glorification of bourgeois prowess, the tastes of the city and the behaviour of Jacobean audiences. The discussion is loaded with a painful amount of pretentious and superficial writing, attempts at local and historical colour which only result in the misuse of technical terms ('the Worshipful Company of Aldermen') and the general substitution of rhetoric for reason. The continental romances, we are told, never had 'wide vogue among the English aristocracy' owing to the appeal of the Arthurian legends 'with their organic religious principle and their fine consecrations, together with their distinctly national aroma'—whatever all this may mean. Commoners on the other hand fed on the popular chap-books and romances which went abroad to town and village 'in their attractive bindings.' One would be curious to know the source of Dr Murch's information concerning the binding of these books—most popular prints had none at all. In the same uncritical and hasty spirit he quotes passages from a seventeenth century writer, and refers not to the original but to M. Jusserand—misquotes, moreover, and gives a wrong reference. He seldom gives chapter and verse for any allusion and is quite content to call a play by its sub-title.

It is a relief to turn to the text of the play, which is distinctly above the average. The first quarto has been reprinted verbatim with all its errors. How far this is a judicious proceeding may, indeed, be questioned. It is one thing so to reproduce a play from the 1616 folio of Ben Jonson, quite another to follow the same method in such a case as this. However, it is a safeguard against undue tampering with the text. The title-page is inaccurately given. Not only has the line arrangement been altered, but the reading '*natos*' has been altered to '*natum*.' With

this exception, and the appendix of 1635 already mentioned, the text appears, so far as it has been possible to test it, very reasonably accurate. Something, however, has gone wrong with I, 165 where 'became' should be 'beame.' The text of an edition is an important feature, and a trustworthy reprint is always welcome.

W. W. Greg.

Cambridge.

The Development and Chronology of Chaucer's Works. By John S. P. Tatlock. (Chaucer Society.) London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner and Co., 1907. 8vo. xiv + 233 pp.

We have here a valuable contribution to Chaucer scholarship, and a further indication of the healthy activity which characterises the pursuit of English studies in America. Owing to the superior organisation of research in the universities of the United States, we in this country are in danger of being altogether outstripped; and it is a pleasure to note how keenly the minutest details relating to Chaucer and his works are discussed by transatlantic scholars. Dr Tatlock is well known as a Chaucer scholar, and he here contributes to the publications of the Chaucer Society a discussion on the development and chronology of the principal works, omitting the minor poems for want of space. The author deserves credit for fully exposing the baselessness of some of the assumptions which have been made or accepted by scholars without any real support of evidence; though it must be admitted that he spins a few cobwebs of his own, which others who come after him will have to sweep away. If in the remarks which follow doubt is cast upon some of his conclusions, it must not be inferred that the value of the work as a whole is denied. Even when the author is arguing for a probably baseless theory, he usually gives us a valuable collection of materials for forming an opinion, which are presented with as much fairness and impartiality as can be expected from an eager disputant.

Dr Tatlock's study begins with a discussion of the supposed two versions of *Troilus and Criseyde*, with regard to which he has had the advantage of using Dr McCormick's unpublished work; and here he seems to have fairly established his case. On the vexed question of the date of the original text of the poem he supports with further argument the view which he has formerly advocated, namely that Gower's mention in the *Mirour de l'Omme* of

> la geste
> De Troylus et de la belle
> Creseide

is a reference to Chaucer's poem, and consequently that this latter must be as early as 1377, a conclusion for which he thinks other cogent

reasons may be urged. His arguments, however, are by no means convincing. It is extremely unlikely that Gower was referring here to a particular poem, and especially to such a long and elaborate piece of work as Chaucer's, which, we may add, could not possibly be 'sung,' whatever Chaucer himself may say when in straits for a rhyme. The reference to Troilus as a lover by Froissart is enough to show that the love-story, as told by Benoît, was well known, and whether the change of name (Briseida to Criseida), on which so much stress is laid, was first made by Boccaccio or not (the difference between Griseida and Criseida is not really important), the occurrence of the new form Criseida in at least one 14th century MS. of Guido is significant. Incidentally it may be remarked that it is very unsafe to assert positively that Gower knew no Italian. Italian was not a very out-of-the-way language, and it must have been familiar to many in the mercantile world of London in the 14th century. Why again must the reference in the *Confessio Amantis* (IV, 2794) be to Chaucer's *Troilus*? Why not (for example) to Benoît? But these questions, of the popularity of the Troilus love-story and the use of the name Criseida, will doubtless be determined eventually by further evidence. As to the suggested revision of Chaucer's *Troilus* before 1387, the supposed date of the *Testament of Love*, there is nothing here which is inconsistent with the date 1382–3 for the original production. Indeed it is more likely that the revision took place early, than that Chaucer should have returned to the poem after an interval of many years.

Dr Tatlock has dealt fully and faithfully with the now utterly discredited theory of a *Palamon and Arcite* in stanzas. It is perhaps worth while even now to have the arguments effectively stated, and the metrical examination of the *Knight's Tale* which Dr Tatlock gives us is really convincing. There is no difficulty in supposing that a *Palamon and Arcite* in couplets, practically identical with the *Knight's Tale*, came between *Troilus* and the *Legend of Good Women*; but there is no need to suggest that the phrase 'though the story is knowen lyte' means anything more than that it was not told in Classical authors:

> Tanto negli anni riposta e nascosa,
> Che Latino autor non par ne dica,
> Per quel ch' io senta, in libro alcuna cosa.

With regard to the two Prologues to the *Legend of Good Women* Dr Tatlock is on the side of Professor Lowes, though he thinks that the intricacy of the question has hardly been fully appreciated. He offers further argument for the idea that the poem was at first written in honour of the Queen, and that the revision was undertaken after her death in 1394, out of consideration for the feelings of King Richard, who could endure no reference to her after her death.

In dealing with the *Canterbury Tales* Dr Tatlock accepts the suggestion of a direct reference to Katherine Swinford in the *Doctor's Tale*,

an idea which is almost excluded by Chaucer's personal connexion with her. On p. 187 he refers to a mention in Gower's *Vox Clamantis* of the crusade of the Bp of Norwich, as evidence that the third book of that poem was written later than 1382. He should have observed that this mention is made only in a marginal note, which was certainly added after the first composition of the work, as is shown by the fact that it appears only in the MSS. which represent the later recension. The suggestions with regard to the relations of the *Shipman's Tale* with the *Prologue of the Wife of Bath*, and of both with the *Merchant's Tale*, are interesting but rather speculative. More detailed discussion on the *Canterbury Tales* is reserved for a future volume, to which we look forward with interest, and also with the hope that it may contain what is unfortunately lacking in the present book, namely an index. Dr Tatlock admits that his conclusions are not all equally valuable. 'They are presented for what they are worth, because the publication of plausible conjecture, founded on investigation and recognised as conjecture, leads in the long run to the most fruitful and reliable results.' The keenness of modern controversy on subjects relating to Chaucer justifies this attitude. There is no longer any danger that plausible conjecture will impose itself upon scholars or upon the public without due examination.

G. C. Macaulay.

Cambridge.

Chaucer's Prologue and Knight's Tale. Edited by M. Bentinck Smith. Cambridge: University Press. 1908. 8vo. lxxxvii + 229 pp.

Of the making of editions of the *Prologue* and (to a less degree) of the *Knight's Tale* there is no end, and any new edition must be thoroughly good to justify itself. The present edition does so chiefly by the excellence of the introduction. The first four sections deal with Chaucer's life and works and are models of clearness and conciseness. The editor has avoided dogmatism on points still under discussion and has thus escaped the mistake so often made in elementary text-books of treating the subject as if there were no such things as moot-points of scholarship. The fifth section deals with Chaucer's language and is a useful summary of the chief points of importance. In dealing with the *e*-sounds it might have been as well to differentiate the open and close sounds by some parallel other than that of the French *é* and *è*, sounds with which the young student is not of necessity accurately familiar. The statement that *ai, ay* or *ei, ey* are to be pronounced as in Modern English *array, way* must be a slip. The statement that *ch* is pronounced as *tch, even* (the italics are mine) in words of French

origin, is slightly misleading as all early loan-words from French kept what was then the regular French pronunciation of *ch*. In the account of Chaucer's metre something is lost by the failure to discuss his use of secondarily stressed syllables in place of fully stressed ones. The average student has an extremely wooden idea of the structure of Chaucer's verse unless he realises this point. The last three sections of the Introduction deal with the general plan of the *Tales*, the literary characteristics of the *Prologue* and the evolution of the *Knight's Tale*.

The notes are less satisfactory. In classics of a later age one has generally to complain of an excess of notes. In editing Middle English texts, at least for junior students, the case is different. The subtle distinctions of idiom, whether of word or sentence, are only too readily left unnoticed by the student, and timely hints on these points might have been given more freely. Then, too, apt illustrations of medieval life and manners, such as are given in Mr Pollard's excellent editions, are of the highest importance, as they arouse literary and historical interest in Chaucer's work and prevent its study from becoming a mere philological exercise. Notes of this kind are not as full as they might be.

In the note on l. 8 should not 'palatalisation' be 'vocalisation'? In l. 33 the O.N. form is not needed as O.E. *foreweard* is well established. A note should have been given on the difficulties of construction in ll. 173—6. The explanation of 'sho' in l. 253 as the name of a coin seems unnecessary and does not make the passage easier. In the note on l. 710 'alder' is spoken of as a corrupt form of O.E. *ealra*. The use of this epithet in the case of a form which is capable of regular phonetic explanation is misleading, and belongs rather to the pre-scientific days of language-study. In l. 800 if 'this post' refers to the 'sign-post' of the inn (whatever that may be precisely), it is very difficult to explain the previous expression 'sitting by.' In the note on l. 1118 there is a misprint, 'she' for 'sle.' In l. 2534 the form 'cracchen' cannot be Old English, in the sense in which the editor uses that term. These are a few points of criticism on notes which, so far as they go, are excellent.

In conclusion, a word of protest must be raised against the way in which quoted words in the notes are not distinguished either by type or by the use of inverted commas from other words in the sentence. It is not conducive to clearness and is at times positively misleading.

Allen Mawer.

Newcastle.

Orígenes de la Novela. Tomo II. Novelas de los Siglos XV y XVI, con un estudio preliminar de D. M. MENÉNDEZ Y PELAYO. (Nueva Biblioteca de Autores Españoles.) Madrid: Bailly-Baillière e Hijos, 1907. 8vo. cxl + 587 pp.

Primera Crónica General. Estoria de España que mandó componer Alfonso el Sabio y se continuaba bajo Sancho IV en 1289. Publicada por RAMÓN MENÉNDEZ PIDAL. Tomo I. Texto. (Same Series.) 1906. iv + 774 pp.

Libros de Caballerias. Primera Parte. Ciclo arturico. Ciclo carolingio. Por ADOLFO BONILLA Y SAN MARTÍN. (Same Series.) 1907. 556 pp.

Comedias de Tirso de Molina. Tomo II. Coleccion ordenada e ilustrada por D. EMILIO COTARELO Y MORI. (Same Series.) 1907. xlvi + 742 pp.

Crónicas del Gran Capitán. Por ANTONIO RODRÍGUEZ VILLA. (Same Series.) 1908. xvii + 612 pp.

The volumes of the new *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles* follow each other with most commendable promptness. The second volume of the *Origins of the Novel* does not yield in interest or importance to the first, which appeared in 1905. It consists of an Introduction covering 140 pages, and the following texts: *Cárcel de Amor* of Diego de San Pedro; *Question de Amor*; Villalon, *Diálogo de las Transformaciones* (inedited), *El Crotalon*; the *Diana* of Montemayor; *Diana Enamorada* of Gil Polo; *Pastor de Filida* of Montalvo and the *Coloquios satíricos* of Antonio de Torquemada. Among the subjects discussed by Sr. Menéndez y Pelayo in the introduction are the Italian novelists in Spain; the widely known *Silva de Varia Leccion* of Mexia; the *Sobremesa y Alivio de Caminantes* and the *Patrañuelo* of Timoneda, and lastly the *Noches de Invierno* of Antonio de Eslava.

This preliminary essay shows all the qualities which were so conspicuous in the first volume of this work and for which the author is noted: vast erudition and a brilliancy of exposition in which he is unequalled. The English reader will be especially interested in the detailed discussion of Antonio de Eslava's *Noches de Invierno* (which appeared at Pamplona in 1609) 'gran curiosidad bibliográfica, ya por el remoto orígen de algunas de sus fábulas, ya por la extraordinaria fortuna que alguna de ellas, original al parecer, ha tenido en el orbe literario, prestando elementos á una de las creaciones de Shakespeare' (p. cxxii). It is in the fourth chapter of the *Primera Noche* that Richard Garnett and other modern English scholars, as Sr. Menéndez says, believed they saw the germ of Shakespeare's fantastic drama *The Tempest.* He concludes: 'Las semejanzas de este argumento con el de *The Tempest* son tan obvias que parece difícil dejar de admitir una imitación directa.' But, he says: 'Este es sin duda el esquema de la obra shakespiriana, pero ¡cuán lejos está de la obra misma! Todo lo que tiene de profundo y simbólico, todo lo que tiene de musical y etéreo, es creación propia del

genio de Shakespeare, que nunca se mostró tan admirablemente lírico como en esta prodigiosa fantasía, la cual, por su misma vaguedad, sumerge el espíritu en inefable arrobamiento.' The type in which the texts are printed unfortunately lacks the clearness of some of the other volumes.

One of the most important books in Spanish literature is unquestionably the *General Chronicle of Spain* by Alfonso the Learned (died 1284). It was first published at Zamora in 1541 and again at Valladolid in 1604; both these editions have become exceedingly rare. Of this *Chronicle* Ticknor says: 'Everywhere it breathes the spirit of its age, and, when taken together, is not only the most interesting of the Spanish chronicles, but the most interesting of all that in any country mark the transition from its poetical and romantic traditions to the grave exactness of historical truth.' The *Crónica General* was a storehouse that was freely used by the writers of ballads and the dramatists, Lope de Vega especially having founded a number of his dramas on incidents related in it.

No living scholar was as well equipped for the extremely difficult task of editing the new edition of the *Crónica General* as Sr. Menéndez Pidal, author of the *Leyenda de los Siete Infantas de Lara*. His account of the various unsuccessful attempts to renew the edition of Florian de Ocampo are interesting. It was finally decided to include it in the *Biblioteca de Autores Españoles* when the first series was originally projected, but Cayetano Rosell, who was charged with it, shrank from the stupendous task of editing a work which, as he said, the Academy of History would never attempt, though the labour of providing a new edition had been imposed upon them as long ago as 1798. 'What disheartens anyone who studies this chronicle,' Sr. Menéndez Pidal says, 'is the great divergence which is revealed on comparing the many codices which are preserved of this long text.' The editor further says: 'Having devoted myself for many years to the study of the manuscripts of the Crónicas, I believe that I have succeeded in making a classification of them, fixing the various compilations and reworkings which they represent and the periods to which they belong. The MSS. which were formerly confounded under the title of *Crónica General del Rey Sabio* are the fruit of almost centuries of histriographic activity, beginning with the *Primera Crónica General*, commanded to be written by Alfonso X., and following with the "Crónica General of 1344," that of the "Twenty Kings," the Third and Fourth Chronicle General, that of 1404, and others of less importance...I hope in the present publication to have succeeded in offering the *Primera Crónica General* free from the many interpolations and rearrangements of every kind which it has suffered in the course of time.' The edition now published is a delight to the eye; it is presented in new clear type which renders it easy and pleasant reading. Sr. Menéndez Pidal has conferred a boon upon all interested in the early history and literature of Spain for which they cannot fail to be grateful.

The Spanish Romances of Chivalry had been treated with considerable fulness by Sr. Menéndez y Pelayo in the first volume of his

Orígenes de la Novela. The well known scholar Sr. Bonilla y San Martín has now published a volume of the Romances of Chivalry of the Arthurian and Carolingian cycles. Only the texts are here presented, without any introductory matter, which is to follow in a second volume. This one contains (1) *El Baladro del Sabio Merlin, Primera Parte de la Demanda del Sancto Grial.* This is, apparently (for it is nowhere stated), a reprint of the volume that was issued at Burgos in 1498, and of which only a single copy is in existence, so far as is known. The other *Baladro del Sabio Merlin,* different from the first, at least in part, and which contains besides a series of prophecies, which was several times printed with the *Demanda del Sancto Grial,* is contained in the British Museum in the earliest edition known, Toledo, 1515. This was evidently inaccessible to Sr. Bonilla, who has reprinted the edition of Seville, 1535: (2) *La Demanda del Sancto Grial con los marauillosos fechos de Lançarote y de Galas su hijo.* Segunda Parte de la Demanda del Sancto Grial. (3) *Libro del Esforzado Caballero don Tristan de Leonis y de sus grandes hechos en Armas,* printed at Seville in 1528, a Spanish translation of the French prose version. There is an edition published at Valladolid in 1501 by Juan de Burgos, a copy of which was in the Salvá-Heredia collection. (4) *Crónica de los muy notables Caualleros Tablante de Ricamonte y de Jofre hijo del Conde Don Anson,* printed at Estella in 1564. In the Carolingian Cycle: (5) *Cuento del Emperador Carlos Maynes e de la Emperatris Seuilla,* published according to the MS. h-j-13, of the Escurial library, with a facsimile of a page of the manuscript. The second volume of Sr. Bonilla's publication will contain, beside the introductory matter, among other texts, the fragment of the Spanish *Tristan* in prose, the MS. of which is in the Vatican library. It will be awaited with eagerness by all who are interested in these romances, which have played such an important part in the literature of Spain.

With the second volume of the *Comedias de Tirso de Molina,* Sr. Cotarelo y Mori concludes the publication of those plays of the great 'Mercenario,' the greater part of which have been inaccessible to the general student of the Spanish drama. It comprises twenty-eight plays, including *El Burlador de Sevilla,* previously printed by Hartzenbusch, and *Tan largo me lo fiais,* attributed to Calderon, and which was published, together with two comedias by Guillen de Castro in 1878 in the *Libros raros.* The volume contains, besides, an excellent *Catálogo razonado del Teatro de Tirso de Molina,* occupying forty-six pages, and which shows that out of about four hundred plays which Tirso wrote, just eighty-six are still extant. The plays are evidently printed with great care, in clean, clear type, agreeable to the eye and should gain many readers for the great dramatist. Sr. Cotarelo, to whose important publications the student of the Spanish drama owes so much, is to be congratulated on the excellent manner in which he has fulfilled this difficult and very exacting task.

In the *Crónicas del Gran Capitán,* Sr. Antonio Rodríguez Villa, well known for his edition of the *Diálogo de los Pajes* and other works,

publishes a number of chronicles relating to Don Gonçalo de Córdoba. The first of these, called *Las dos Conquistas del Reino de Nápoles*, appeared originally at Zaragoza in 1554. Other editions appeared at Zaragoza 1559, Seville 1580 (also 1582, not mentioned by the editor), and Alcalá de Henares 1584. The latter, which seemed the most correct to the editor, is the one here reprinted. A comparison of this reprint with a copy of the original in the writer's possession, shows that the new edition is done with great care. It may be mentioned in passing that this is the book which Ticknor calls 'the poor and dull chronicle of the life of Gonzalvo.' In the preface this chronicle is falsely ascribed to Hernando Pérez del Pulgar, Señor de Salar. Sr. Rodríguez Villa also publishes (2) the anonymous *Crónica manuscrita*, from the MS. in the Biblioteca Nacional, (3) the *Vita di Consalvo Fernando di Cordova, detto il Gran Capitano* by Paolo Giovio, Firenze, 1550, translated into Spanish and published at Zaragoza in 1554, and (4)—by far the most interesting of all—the *Breve Parte de las Hazañas del excelente nombrado Gran Capitán* por Hernán Pérez del Pulgar, first published at Seville in 1527, and better known in the excellent little edition of Martínez de la Rosa.

These volumes of the *Nueva Biblioteca de Autores Españoles* have well fulfilled their promise and we wish them the success which they so richly deserve.

Hugo A. Rennert.

Philadelphia, Pa. U.S.A.

The Life and Works of Christóbal Suárez de Figueroa. By J. P. Wickersham Crawford. (Publications of the University of Pennsylvania; Series in Romanic Languages and Literatures, No. 1.) Philadelphia, Pa. 1907. 8vo. 159 pp.

Suárez de Figueroa is remembered chiefly as the translator of Guarini's *Pastor Fido*, a version highly praised in *Don Quixote*; but till recently little was known of him beyond the fact that he returned thanks by sharply criticizing Cervantes, and other prominent contemporaries, in *El Passagero*. Mr Crawford's researches confirm the impression that Suárez de Figueroa was an ill-conditioned, querulous person, and they supply much welcome information concerning the writer. Born at Valladolid about the year 1571, Suárez de Figueroa never attained the popularity to which he thought himself entitled. This is not altogether surprising. He began life by quarrelling with his family, went to seek his fortune in Italy, and, in the intervals of leisure left him by his legal business, cultivated literature. On the death of his parents he returned to Spain in 1604, fell into difficulties, started on a pilgrimage to Santiago de Compostela, quarrelled with a muleteer near Cuéllar, and was arrested on suspicion of having murdered a man at Valladolid. The charge was unfounded, but the incident illustrates Suárez de Figueroa's facility for getting into hot

water, and henceforward he was constantly at warfare with his neighbours. His attitude to the rest of the world is visible in his works. *La Constante Amarilis* is, indeed, in a eulogistic vein, for it commemorates the love-match between Juan Andrés Hurtado de Mendoza (afterwards Marqués de Cañete) and Doña María de Cárdenas. But here again Suárez de Figueroa invented a grievance. He joined Cañete's household in 1609 (the year in which *La Constante Amarilis* was published), but retired in 1616, complaining that his patron had not rewarded him sufficiently. He duly recorded his disappointment in *El Passagero*, and, when the second edition of *La España defendida* was issued in 1644, it appeared without the laudatory stanza in honour of Cañete which had embellished the first edition of 1612. Few were fortunate enough to obtain Suárez de Figueroa's approval; Cervantes, Lope de Vega and Ruiz de Alarcón came under his displeasure, and he seems to have succeeded at last in uniting all the literary cliques against him. In 1622 he returned to Italy, became *Auditor* of Lecce, was dismissed next year, and was appointed later *Auditor* of Catanzaro. Here, as might be expected, he again got in trouble, and—unfortunately for himself—was marked down by the Inquisition: on this curious incident, rather creditable than otherwise to the victim, Mr Crawford's investigations throw much light. Suárez de Figueroa appears for the last time on October 10, 1633, when he signed the *aprobación* to Gonzalo de Saavedra's *Los Pastores del Betis*; but there is reason to think that he survived till 1644, or a little later.

Mr Crawford is careful to say that Suárez de Figueroa was not a great writer, but is inclined to 'honour him as a man of high moral principles, and as a steadfast champion of the highest literary and political ideals.' It may be so; Suárez de Figueroa had the desperate courage of his opinions, and a concentrated bitterness of expression that is often telling; yet it is by no means obvious what his ideals were. But, apart from his literary importance, the present excellent monograph is welcome: it places the author in his exact relation to his contemporaries, establishes the chief events in his troubled life, and supplies a bibliography of his works—several of which have vanished.

J. Fitzmaurice-Kelly.

London.

Les Troubadours: leurs vies, leurs œuvres, leur influence. Par Joseph Anglade. Paris. 1908. viii + 323 pp.

M. Anglade, who is already known as the author of an excellent study of Giraut Riquier, the last of the troubadours, has produced an attractive introduction to Provençal lyric poetry in this book. A certain superficiality of treatment is explained by the fact that the book is the outcome of a course of lectures addressed to an audience which possessed no special knowledge of the subject. The book is thus intended to appeal to a wider circle of readers than *provençalistes* pure and simple, and this

purpose it seems well adapted to perform. Four introductory chapters deal with preliminary matters, the difference between 'troubadour' and 'jongleur,' the technique of their art and its environment: here, also, M. Anglade refers to that hoary fiction 'the courts of love.' The several periods of troubadour poetry are then dealt with and chapters are devoted to the troubadours in Italy, Spain, Portugal and Germany. An excellent feature of the book is the full bibliography to each chapter, which should prove useful to any who wish to begin the study of Provençal. We note one or two omissions. As to the *trobar clus* (p. 54) reference might have been made to P. Andraud's thesis, *Quae judicia de litteris fecerint Provinciales*, Paris, 1902, and more space should have been given to the subject in view of its influence upon Dante's theory of style: the troubadour Gavaudan (A. Jeanroy in *Romania*, XXXIV, p. 497) provides excellent examples of intentional obscurity. Pratsch's thesis on Folquet de Marselha supports the impossible view that the troubadour and the bishop were different persons: reference should have been made to Zingarelli's *La personalità storica di Folchetto di Marsiglia*, Bologna, 1899. In reference to religious poetry, room might have been found for a mention of Peire de Corbiac's hymn to the Virgin, while Dante da Majano's sonnet in Provençal does not appear in the chapter upon Italy. These, however, are trivialities and the book can be heartily recommended to anyone who requires a general introduction to Provençal lyric poetry.

H. J. Chaytor.

Plymouth.

Ovid und die Troubadours. Von Wilibald Schrötter. Halle: Niemeyer. 1908. 8vo. 111 pp.

This book or brochure, within the limits imposed by the title, attempts to do for Ovid what Comparetti did for Virgil in his *Virgil in the Middle Ages*. Ovid's influence upon medieval literature is well-known and Herr Schrötter rightly devotes his early pages to an estimate of its extent. He shows that, so far as the troubadours were concerned, Ovidian influence reached them indirectly through the schoolmen, who adopted ideas from Ovid for literary purposes of their own and thus made them common property. Thus, though it be granted that the artificial troubadour poetry was developed from a popular poetry, we must not forget that the course of this development was influenced by the learned poetry and literary culture of the middle ages, and to this culture Ovid had materially contributed. Ovid's influence was also immediate: some troubadours were doubtless able to read his works in the original: others learned his mythology and his similes at second hand and a considerable number of passages can be quoted which are direct imitations of Ovid's language.

The difficulty which besets literary criticism of this kind is to decide whether resemblances are apparent or real, whether they belong to that

group of ideas which will naturally occur to any body of writers who devote attention to emotional pathology, or whether they are something more than coincidences. The present question is further complicated by the fact that ideas derived from Ovid certainly formed part of the literary capital of the middle ages, before troubadour poetry had been developed; and to decide whether such ideas, as they appear in troubadour poetry, were borrowed mediately or immediately from Ovid or whether they occurred independently to the troubadour mind, seems often an insuperable difficulty. Herr Schrötter conscientiously goes through the psychology and pathology of love, displaying a wide erudition in the performance of his task and gives a large number of passages which may undoubtedly be regarded as 'parallel.' He also quotes a considerable number which the unprejudiced observer would prefer to ascribe to coincidence: one instance will serve as an example. Ovid, *Her.*, VII, 26 'Aenean animo noxque diesque refert' is placed opposite to Bernart de Ventadorn, 'domna, cui sopley nueyt e dia': to call this 'eine direkte Entlehnung' (p. 45), 'eine wörtliche Nachahmung' (p. 67) is sheer exaggeration. The phenomenon of the sleepless lover might be paralleled from many sources in both ancient and modern literature, and an unduly large number of the passages compared are of this character. The obvious differences between Ovid and the Troubadours are well brought out, especially as regards the ennobling character of love in troubadour poetry, an ideal which was alien to Ovid. Herr Schrötter misses a point when he quotes 'militat omnis amans et habet sua castra Cupido' (p. 86). Ovid was not merely using a military metaphor, but was expressing the antimilitarist sentiments of the decadent aristocracy for whom he wrote: antimilitarism is not necessarily a troubadour characteristic. There are few misprints in the book (peur for puer, p. 44) but we miss a few footnotes: 'Pelias' lance,' for instance, might have been credited to its discoverer, who must be sought in the bibliography at the beginning of the book.

H. J. Chaytor.

Plymouth.

Tables synoptiques de Phonologie de l'ancien français. Par H. E. Berthon et V. G. Starkey. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1909. 24 pp.

It was a bold undertaking to offer in some 12 tables and 24 pages a conspectus of Old French phonology and much labour and ingenuity have been required in its execution. The work is offered to the beginner in Romance languages and he will find here a presentment more precise and more tangible than he would discover elsewhere. The large pages (12 inches by 10), neatly divided into compartments, present an artful array of the beautiful types the Clarendon Press has at its disposal. Since the disposition of the matter is geometric, our account of it shall be as orderly as possible.

Table I. (Voyelles toniques, libres.)

The twofold development of Latin *ē* and *ĭ* to *oi* on the one hand, and to *ai* [ɛ] on the other, is not made sufficiently clear; the earliest trace of [ɛ] is indeed mentioned but the change might seem only to concern the endings of the imperfects of verbs, while the change of Latin *e* to French *i* when a long *i* occurs as the final letter of the form (e.g. *presi* > *pris*) is hidden away among the paroxytona at the end of Table IV. It is impossible to compress the various changes Latin *a* has undergone into the small space allotted to them and no place, apparently, is found for the special French *ie* < *á* after *t, d, r, s* (etc. but not labials) when the preceding syllable contains an *i*; thus the many Old French infinitives in *-ier*, nfr. *-er* find no mention. This rigid condensation led to the committal of a serious blunder, the remark that *ai* occurs as an ascending diphthong in the *Vie de Saint Alexis*; the editors had doubtless in their notes the assonances, *pais* (< *pacem*): *paiast* (strophe 19) and also *pais* (< *pagum* + *ensem*): *venir* (strophe 36) and the desire to be brief caused a confusion of the two. Following each table are a number of 'remarques' which we think should often have been fuller; thus Thomas's theory of *-arius* > *ier* through Germanic influence is accepted without the reservation that the change of quality of the vowel is perhaps older than umlaut in German. There seems to be no reason why umlaut should not be considered as a French phenomenon; it has to be accepted for **illi* > *il*, **sesi* > *sis*; again remarque 2° that Latin *a* between palatals becomes *i* seems to us too bald seeing that we possess clear evidence of the change in Popular Latin of initial *ja-* to *je* (*Januarius* > *Jenuarius*; cf. Italian *gennajo* and ofr. *jenvier*). There appears to be no mention of ofr. palatal + á + nasal, and in the 'remarques' or elsewhere some mention should have been made of ofr. verb-forms *mui, conui*, etc.

Table II. (Voyelles toniques, entravées.)

The casier that contains *ē* + nasal should also have included *ĕ* + nasal and also, though examples are rare, a case of *ŏ* + *n* mouillé + consonant might have been given. We should consider too that in *ō* + *n* mouillé final, it is inadvisable to quote without explanation the two spellings *coin* and *poing*. The phrase 'pendant tout le moyen-âge' should be used sparingly; we are told, for example, that during that period *au* is a descending diphthong, i.e., not yet reduced to *o* and still spellings like *omosne, obe* are to be met with. The most likely explanation of *ĕ* + *l* + consonant > *eau* seems to be that a glide of undetermined value occurred between the *e* and *l* (as in Southern English *milk*) and that the glide only became *a* when *l* became *u*.

Table III. Remarque 5°.

The 'loi de Darmsteter' should not have been made shorter than its originator intended and examples of the persistence of a vowel other than *a* > *e* as in *quadri-furcum* > *carrefour* should have been given.

Table IV.

In the development of the type *tepidum* > *tiède*, we think that a more likely explanation is the 'balance theory,' according to which the similarity of force of *i* and *u* retained the penultimate vowel till such time as *e* had become *ie*. This theory is of use in explaining the various forms of verbs in *-icare* etc., such as ofr. *venches* < *vindicas* compared with *venjons* < *vindic-umus*.

Table V.

The statement that *c* [*k*] may be seen in English *carry, carpenter*, 'importés en Angleterre par voie de l'Anglo-norman,' would seem to suggest that in agn. initial *ca* remains *ca-*; more French words in English from initial Latin *ca* have *ch-* than *c-*, e.g., *chafe, change, chamber*, etc.

Table VI.

The Latin *qu* seems inadequately summarised and not very clear: thus we find ofr. *aive* side by side with nfr. *suivre* when ofr. *sivre* would have been more appropriate; it seems also a mistake to include in this same casier *cuisine* < *cocina*: the popular Latin forms *cocina* and *cocus* (i.e., *qu* already simplified to *c*) have ample justification, the latter occurs in the *Appendix Probi*.

Table VIII.

Among the cases of the omission of *f* before *o* and *u* it is a mistake to quote ofr. *reüser*[1] < **refusare*; the correct etymology is doubtless **retusare* from *retundo*.

Table IX B. Casier B.

The Germanic influence might have been accounted for by pointing out that Germanic dialects possessed words corresponding to *gué, guêpe* and *gâter*[2], of similar meaning and with initial *w*, viz. ndl. *wadde*, ohg. *wefsa* and *wuosti*; a contamination of like nature might also serve to explain the *h* aspiré of *herse* as there was certainly a Germanic word cognate with English *harrow* (Gothic **harwi*). We heartily recommend students to acquire the work and to keep it in a place of easy access. It seems a pity that no index was added. Those who use Suchier's *Voyelles toniques* know what a great improvement the French indexed edition is on the original German. We hope that a second edition will contain this useful change.

A. T. Baker.

Sheffield.

[1] Godefroy quotes many examples of *reuser* in the sense of 'drive back' but none in that of 'retire'; the following may interest readers.

Quida fantosme avoir trové
Arriere est auques reusé.

[MS. B. M. Add. 36614 f° 279 v°b.]

[2] Afr. also offers a pair of doublets of this nature; *vimblet* and *guimblet* where the Latin verbs are **vimbrare, vimblare* < *vibrare* and Germanic *weifen*.

MINOR NOTICES.

All who are interested in early printing or in the *Roman de la Rose*, will welcome the recent book by F. W. Bourdillon: *The Early Editions of the Roman de la Rose* (1906). This splendidly printed volume is issued by the Bibliographical Society, and bears the number XIV among the publications of the society. The author subscribes to the conclusions reached by M. Claudin in his excellent treatise with regard to the first three—and not four—editions. He has been able to date more closely than heretofore several of the undated editions, and does this mainly by means of 'internal, or textual, comparison.' It must be said that the application made of this method offers every appearance of care and skill. The discussion of the first folios (p. 13 *et ss.*) offers a good example of the author's method. One of the most valuable parts of the book is the Description of the Twenty-one Editions (p. 35 *et ss.*). Here will be found in the space of a little more than thirty pages bibliographical information worth far more than the cost of the entire volume. Typographically, too, one can but praise this section of the work. A surprising thing about the fourteen earliest editions is stated on p. 147: they all are derived from one original, though there were scores and scores of manuscripts from which various readings could have been adopted. The volume closes with a large number of exact reproductions of the early cuts (pp. 209–48).

R. W.

This volume of *Select Translations from Old English Prose*, edited by Albert S. Cook and Chauncey B. Tinker (Boston, Ginn & Co., 1908), is a companion one to Cook's *Select Translations from Old English Poetry*. For the student of literature it is not of much value, for unfortunately Old English prose is an almost negligible quantity when considered as literature. The greater number of the extracts are translations from Old English translations of Latin historians or homilists. Their style in Old English is artificial and unnatural and this defect cannot be remedied in a translation yet a stage further removed from the original. Least satisfactory are the selections from Bede's *History* based on Giles' translation. The language is highly Latinised, stilted and unnatural. Happiest are Professor Cook's own translations from Alfred's preface to the *Pastoral Care* and his fellow-editor's translations from Alfred's *Boethius*.

For the student of history and of Early English culture the book should prove most useful as an introduction to many of the original authorities for pre-Conquest days. Here the notes on the extracts from the Chronicle might have been fuller and the extracts from Orosius dealing with the voyages of Ohthere and Wulfstan should have been given *in extenso* both for their intrinsic merit and also as examples of

genuine native English prose. Fuller comment on the rather difficult geography of the voyages might have been made and Alfred's own account of the Teutonic peoples should have been included in the passages selected.

The translations which read most easily are those from Aelfric, who possesses that gift of colloquial ease which was denied to most of the writers of Old English prose. A word of praise must also be said for the translation of the famous *Sermo Lupi ad Anglos*. It is one of the most forceful pieces of prose in Old English literature and it loses little in translation.

A. M.

The sole fault to be found with the edition of *Cinco Novelas Ejemplares* of Cervantes in the *Bibliotheca Romanica* (Nos. 41—44. Strassburg, J. H. E. Heitz; London, Chatto and Windus, 1907) is that it contains only five of the *Novelas* (*La Gitanilla, Rinconete y Cortadillo, El Celoso Estremeño, El Casamiento Engañoso* and the *Coloquio que pasó entre Cipion y Berganza*). No doubt these are the best stories in the collection, but many readers will regret the omission of *El Licenciado Vidriera*. A complete, handy and corrected reprint of all twelve is a desideratum, and no one is more competent to supply it than Sr. D. Rufino José Cuervo who, though his name does not appear, is evidently responsible for the present issue. The introduction, a model of laconic presentation, embodies the latest results of research, and the text is naturally based on the first edition of 1613: there exists a reprint (containing numerous variants) which purports to have been brought out at Madrid by Juan de la Cuesta in 1614, but this appears to be a pirated edition put on the market by Lisbon publishers, and, as Cervantes cannot be brought into relation with it, Sr. Cuervo is obviously right in disregarding it. Emendations are introduced sparingly, and with excellent judgment: the spelling is moderately modernized, as it very justifiably may be in a popular edition. Some will be less satisfied with respect to the compromise adopted in the matter of graphic accentuation; naturally enough, Sr. Cuervo cannot reconcile himself to such forms as *opinión* or *razón* in a text of the sixteenth or seventeenth century; but perhaps *clavicímbano* (p. 151), *halléme* (p. 188) and *así* (p. 204) look almost as much out of place. This, however, is chicanery. '1909' (p. 6) is obviously a misprint for 1609, but nothing else seems to have escaped correction. This little volume may be most cordially recommended to all students of Spanish literature.

J. F.-K.